

Sanitized - Approved For Release 96CIA-R

May 6, 1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9893

against the Nazis in Warsaw, and were slain by the thousands while Red armies paused and regrouped before driving forward in a new offensive. It was too late then for them to aid in the Warsaw rising.

Polish divisions fought in the Battle of Monte-Cassino that was raging in Italy at the time of the Warsaw rising. The Polish people are still too big a mouthful for any foreign invader. But they are not yet free. Their religion is persecuted, their lives as freemen are disrupted, and they are subjected to the continual pressure of a threat that the Red armies will return to ravage them. The measure of semiautonomy they have gained, the small measure of semipendence they hold from the Soviet tyranny, is simply evidence that their spirit has not been broken and that the desire of full freedom still burns bright.

Let us remember Poland when we speak of the right of all men everywhere to freedom and the natural guarantees of mankind—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

ILLINOIS BOURBON

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we in Illinois are the proud producers of America's finest bourbon—a whisky distinctly American, a product which has won worldwide acclaim with connoisseurs of the world's finest food and drink.

I will not repeat the historical background of the origin of the word "bourbon," for my colleagues from other States have already dwelt on this.

Suffice it to say that we, in Illinois, have the finest natural resources, the most progressive of producers and the most intense interest in preserving to America the proper and undenied recognition that bourbon belongs to America.

Although I was speaking in Colorado on Monday, May 4, and not present to vote, I was very pleased that Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, designating "bourbon whiskey" as a distinctive product of the United States, passed the House.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF J. EDGAR HOOVER AS DIRECTOR OF THE FBI

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 10, will mark the 40th anniversary of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Speaker, last week the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] introduced a resolution commending Mr. Hoover on this long period of outstanding service. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] checked the matter with me. He had planned to ask to have the resolu-

tion considered at that particular time. I asked the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] if he would place it over until this week so that more Members of the House would know about it and I am sure would want to be here and participate in this commemoration of Mr. Hoover's service.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the resolution can be brought up tomorrow.

I want to bring this matter to the attention of the Members of the House, so, each Member of the House who desires to do so will be able to extend his remarks and participate therein.

But, Mr. Speaker, in case the resolution cannot be called up tomorrow, then I ask unanimous consent that after all scheduled business of the House has been completed on tomorrow and all previous special orders have been completed, that I be permitted to address the House for 1 hour, the purpose of which will be to commemorate Mr. Hoover's long years of service. However, if we do handle the resolution then, of course, I will not take that time. However, I make that unanimous-consent request at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

BIG BROTHER GOVERNMENT AT WORK

(Mr. BOB WILSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an example of big brother government at work in my home area of San Diego.

A large naval repair facility is being phased out. The employees are naturally not pleased. Some of them have come up with a bumper sticker which reads "Phase Out McNamara." I regret that security police yesterday tore these stickers off the workers' cars, and threatened to bar any cars carrying these stickers from the naval facility.

Our Constitution guarantees individuals the rights of redress of grievances against their Government. I feel this arbitrary, highhanded action by the security police is an infringement on the civil rights of individuals who work at the plant. Secretary of Defense McNamara is not a candidate for any office, hence there is no conflict with the Hatch Act or any other Federal regulation.

We do not intend to tolerate Government censorship of free citizens action. I have wired the commanding officer of the establishment in protest of this action. It is time American citizens spoke out and made their feelings known on these and other issues which face our country. I feel that Federal workers in San Diego have a full and just right to protest what they believe is an unwarranted action by their Government. To deprive them of this right by police action is not in accord with the Constitution.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday night to file a report on two bills, the deficiency appropriation bill and the agricultural appropriation bill for 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN reserved all points of order on both bills.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 120]

Andrews, Ala.	Fulton, Tenn.	Mills
Ashley	Garmatz	Montoya
Ashmore	Gibbons	Morris
Avery	Gill	Morrison
Baring	Grant	Norblad
Bass	Hagan, Ga.	Olsen, Mont.
Bates	Halpern	Passman
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey, Mich.	Pilcher
Blatnik	Hawkins	Pool
Bonner	Herlong	Powell
Brademas	Hoffman	Rains
Buckley	Huddleston	Roberts, Ala.
Burleson	Jensen	Scott
Burton, Calif.	Johnson, Pa.	Selden
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Senner
Colmer	Kee	Sheppard
Cramer	King, Calif.	Taft
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Teague, Tex.
Denton	Lankford	Udall
Diggs	Libonati	Ullman
Dorn	Lloyd	Vanik
Dowdy	Maillard	White
Edmondson	Martin, Calif.	Whitten
Elliott	Mathias	Wickersham
Feighan	May	Wilson, Ind.
Finnegan	Meador	Winstead
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	
Forrester	Miller, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY, 1965 APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11134) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

9894

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 6

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11134, with Mr. FASCELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains proposed appropriations in the coming fiscal year, to wit, fiscal year 1965, for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies.

The pending bill would appropriate the amount \$1,702,627,800. This amount compares with budget estimates submitted for 1965, as amended, and 1964 supplemental requests, in the amount \$1,957,764,700, which would mean a reduction in the budget estimates in the amount \$255,136,900.

The amount carried in the bill now pending before the Committee of the Whole for its consideration is \$135,839,200 below the total amount appropriated to date for these agencies in the present fiscal year.

I should point out, however, that a large part of this reduction I have referred to is due to the fact that the new authorization bill for the Area Redevelopment Administration has not as yet been enacted into law. The amount provided also includes \$450,000 for a number of supplemental requests in the current fiscal year 1964 which totaled \$42,675,000.

I should also point out that in a few instances some of the additional permanent positions requested have been allowed, but these increases are offset by other decreases, with the result that the number of permanent positions provided in the accompanying bill for fiscal year 1965 is the same number as the number of authorized positions for the present fiscal year, just under 96,000 permanent positions.

In this connection I should commend the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, for the fact that this year he came before the committee for the second time without a request for a single additional position in the regular annual "Salaries and Expense" item. I should also commend the distinguished Attorney General, Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, for his appearance before the committee during the course of which he requested 50 less permanent positions than he has in the current fiscal year. If we

could get the Department of Commerce to approach their budget on the same basis as the Departments of State and Justice we would have an even better bill here today than we have for you.

This is a good bill, Mr. Chairman, and the fact it is a good bill is due to the courtesy and cooperation I have received from the learned members of the subcommittee, as well as from the clerk of this subcommittee, Mr. Jay B. Howe, who is seated alongside of me. This is the 16th annual supply bill for these agencies that Mr. Howe and I have worked together on, of which 14 bear my name. I could not have succeeded in the reduction of Government expenditures proposed in the pending bill were it not

for the cooperation of the members of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes], the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Slack], the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Lusk], and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG]. I am sincerely indebted to each of them for their cooperation in bringing this bill to the floor for consideration.

The following table summarizes the amounts recommended in the bill in comparison with the corresponding budget estimates and the 1964 appropriations:

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965, as amended, and 1964 supplementals	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (including 1964 supplementals)
Department of State.....	\$341,070,000	\$401,712,000	\$343,837,000	+\$2,767,000	-\$57,875,000
Department of Justice.....	343,899,000	367,887,000	364,036,000	+20,137,000	-3,851,000
Department of Commerce.....	804,500,100	911,969,000	730,086,000	-74,414,100	-181,883,000
Bureau of Public Roads (trust fund).....	(3,249,150,000)	(3,650,000,000)	(3,648,000,000)	(+398,850,000)	(-2,000,000)
The judiciary.....	65,927,900	70,762,700	68,830,800	+2,902,900	-1,931,900
Related agencies.....	283,070,000	205,434,000	195,838,000	-87,232,000	-9,596,000
Total.....	1,838,467,000	1,957,764,700	1,702,627,800	-135,839,200	-255,136,900
Consisting of—					
Related to 1964 supplemental appropriations.....		42,675,000	450,000	+450,000	-42,225,000
Related to 1965 appropriations.....	1,838,467,000	1,915,089,700	1,702,177,800	-136,289,200	-212,911,900

I shall first refer to the Department of State. The total amount recommended for the Department of State is \$343,837,000, which would be a reduction of \$57,875,000 below the total amount of the budget requests. However, four supplemental budget estimates for fiscal year 1964 are included in these figures. The total requested in the four supplemental estimates was \$42,400,000, of which the committee allowed \$400,000.

The largest item of appropriation for the Department of State is entitled "Salaries and Expenses." In connection with this there is an increase over the amount provided in the present fiscal year a large part of which is due to some substantial amounts required to improve their communications facilities. The committee felt their facilities needed improvement and that the Department should go ahead with such improvement.

The second item in this bill is entitled "Representation Allowances," that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] and I discuss annually. I can assure the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that there is only enough of an increase in this item in the pending bill, to wit, \$20,000, to keep them all in good spirits.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is the item that the gentleman is pleased to call the tools of the trade; is that it?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This year it is called good spirits.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman just project this a little bit further? How much would he say there is in toto in this bill for the representation allowances, tools of the trade, for this and other departments?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. In the pending bill there is no increase in any one item for the purpose of entertainment except in this instance and, as I say, this is to keep them all in good spirits. This amount, the \$20,000 increase, compares with a total decrease of \$143,150 in the amounts requested throughout the bill for entertainment and representation allowances.

Mr. GROSS. I will have to say to the gentleman, as he has said to witnesses before his committee, that that has not quite answered the question. The question was, How much is in the bill in toto? if he can give me some estimate, for representation allowances; in other words, the booze fund.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I had assumed the gentleman was thoroughly familiar with this subject, knowing how assiduously he peruses the printed hearings. I did not propose to take the time to go into detail, but in this instance, does the gentleman want the amounts of the 1964 appropriations, the 1965 requests, or the committee allowances?

Mr. GROSS. Just what you are appropriating in your bill for this purpose.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Very well. In the item that we are talking about, "Representation allowances" for the Department of State, the amount is \$993,000. There is \$75,000 here in the contingency fund. There is \$18,000 in the item,

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9895

"Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities." There is \$10,000 in "International activities," Department of Commerce. There is \$3,500 for the Travel Service. There is \$110,000 for the NSIA to use overseas all over the world. There is \$11,750 in connection with the item, "Special international exhibits." Have I sufficiently answered the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman has listed them all, he has sufficiently answered my question.

The next question would be, Does the gentleman think the \$10,000 for entertainment, or whatever it is, to Mr. Herter will help resolve the chicken war over in Geneva?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think the gentleman will find a discussion of his chicken war in the printed committee hearings. We had the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the former Governor of that Commonwealth, the former Secretary of State, before the committee. We trimmed the operation down a bit. The State Department wanted to move 142 people over to Geneva for this parley. They wanted to take the wives and dependents along with them and have the Government pay to take along their automobiles so they could ride throughout the beautiful Swiss countryside. So we trimmed down this ambitious operation.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman. The hearings very well bear him out in that respect. May I say to the gentleman that if he had given Mr. Christian Herter all the automobile hire he wanted for himself and others, I think they would still be coming out at the small end of the horn insofar as the settlement of trade relations is concerned. I want to compliment the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am an optimist in this regard. I do not think this Nation can afford to ignore such trade negotiations. I think it is best that we be properly represented there. I think our people should have sufficient tools of the trade, and I do not refer only to representation allowances, to carry on, and maybe something might be worked out for our best interests.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I just want to ask the gentleman whether the so-called booze allowance is used only for bourbon; we would not want to send anything over there except our national drink; would we?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I find that in most of our embassies whisky and soda is the popular drink.

Mr. LINDSAY. But bourbon is the national drink of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Evidently, the gentleman is not a continental traveler if he does not know that scotch whisky and soda is the popular drink.

Mr. LINDSAY. How could a U.S. embassy serve anything other than our national drink—bourbon?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, we also serve tomato juice and fruit drinks.

Mr. LINDSAY. All kidding aside, Mr. Chairman, I feel that our embassy personnel are entitled to everything they get by way of representation allowances, including the "booze allowance." Too often our embassy people must dip into their own pockets to cover their requirements. They are deserving of all support.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The next item is entitled "Acquisition, Operation, and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad." For this we have provided \$22,125,000 of which \$4 million is contained in the special foreign currency program.

We have substantially reduced this item and deleted entirely the amount of \$2,050,000 requested for two projects in Paris, France; \$2 million of which was to buy a lot upon which to build a new office annex. I think it would take about 40 or 45 minutes to drive from the Place de la Concorde where the present Embassy office building is to get to the site of the proposed office annex during the day when traffic is very heavy in Paris.

The committee has also deleted the request for \$50,000 for plans to initiate the alteration, improvement, and renovation of the property on the Rue du Faubourg St. Honore in Paris, known as the Rothschild mansion. This piece of property as it stands is worth at least \$3 million in American money. If allowed to go ahead, with the present thinking of the foreign building office and the Department of State, our Ambassador in Paris would have a \$5 million residence. We did not think we should do this, particularly at the present time.

The next item to which I shall refer is entitled "Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Activities." There the committee has allowed \$44,125,000. Included in this is an additional \$1.5 million in connection with a treaty made not too long ago with Japan. This treaty resulted in our being requested to appropriate \$25 million worth of our Japanese yen, to remain available until expended.

The committee looked this over carefully and decided to appropriate the equivalent of the interest that could be generated from \$25 million worth of yen, at 6 percent or \$1.5 million.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Just so that this may be clear for the record. What the gentleman is saying is that we are making payments of that amount, but we are not paying interest on this \$25 million. Actually, we are making a payment which would be equal to the interest rate; is that not correct?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. BOW. We are paying no interest on \$25 million.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No, we merely arrived at the \$1.5 million figure by computing the interest at 6 percent on \$25 million.

Mr. BOW. In other words, that is what we would have been paying.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I was astounded to read in the hearings that any American official, and I have forgotten which one it was, would say that this was a good settlement—this settlement of the \$1,800 million obligation owed to us by the Japanese for \$490 million of which \$25 million was earmarked for cultural purposes. Then they have the colossal gall to come before a committee of the Congress and say that this was a debt settlement.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is very seldom that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa and I agree, but in this instance I am in accord with the gentleman's statement that this was not a good settlement. I think we should have obtained a better settlement, but I would not want to press for a better settlement to the extent of disrupting the amicable relations presently existing between the Japanese people and the American people and their Governments.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot agree with the gentleman in his latter premise. I think it was wrong to earmark \$25 million in view of the fact that we only got \$490 million out of the \$1,800 million operation. I think it is wrong. I think it is wrong in this bill to make any kind of settlement such as that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. One of the usual difficulties is that every time our diplomats make a settlement on anything with another nation, our cultural people have to get into the act and earmark so much of the settlement for all these alleged cultural programs which are not of great benefit to the American taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Coming to the Department of Justice, you will find that the bill contains \$364,036,000 for that highly important branch of Government.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, before he takes up the items for the Department of Justice, for an inquiry?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I should like to inquire as to whether there is anything in the appropriation bill which would limit our contributions to the United Nations. I believe that would be under the contributions to international organizations.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is provided in basic law.

Mr. HALL. Is there anything which would limit our contributions to the U.N. Special Fund and to the U.N. Technical Assistance Fund, the Middle East Refugee Relief, and so on, to the 32.06 percent which is generally applicable?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is referring to items which are not in this bill but which I assume will be in the foreign aid bill. Those items, to which the gentleman refers have nothing to do with the pending bill.

Mr. HALL. The bill has nothing to do with that?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There is nothing here, insofar as international organizations are concerned, not authorized by law.

Mr. HALL. Would the gentleman advise us as to what the contributions to international organizations of more than \$87 million consist of, in general?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Those are very succinctly set forth at pages 4 and 5 of the committee report. Has the gentleman read the committee report?

Mr. HALL. Yes; I have.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Then the gentleman will find each organization listed, by name, and the amount of contribution; the total being \$87,168,000.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, the first item is for the United Nations and specialized agencies, under which is the item for the United Nations, the item for UNESCO, and so forth.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is reading correctly.

Mr. HALL. My query is whether or not there are any contributions to the Special Fund or to the Technical Assistance Fund above the 32.06 percent.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The answer, as I said a while ago, is "No." The gentleman will not find the Special Fund listed in these items.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly before he proceeds to the next department's items?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any funds available under the terms of the bill to be spent for getting summer jobs for foreign students?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We were requested to supply such funds, but we have taken them out of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We do not have that sort of thing for American students.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly correct.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Considering that we go to the expense of bringing the foreign students here, pay for their travel, keep them, and give them an education, why should we also and at the same time run a Federal agency to get them summer jobs?

Mr. GROSS. Again I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am for our American students first.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any funds for travel expenses for exchange lecturers, if the gentleman recalls?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes; there are some. That would be under the educational exchange activities. This program has been going on for years.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but I believe that some of this stuff ought to stop.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, they want to bring their dependents with them and to enlarge the taxpayers' expenditure further and further. The committee balked at doing this.

Mr. GROSS. I understand.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The House has approved the committee action in this regard on previous occasions.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the committee for going as far as it did, but I believe we ought to stop some of this spending. It makes quite a bit of interesting reading, to learn about these exchange lecturers.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am gratified to learn that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa approves this bill and its provisions.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, oh; I did not say that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If I may continue, I shall now refer to the items for the Department of Justice.

As I started to say, the bill contains \$364,036,000 for the very important Department of Justice, which would be an increase of \$20,137,000 over the amounts appropriated for the current fiscal year and a reduction of \$3,851,000 compared to the total budget requests.

The various activities include the Office of the Solicitor General, the Tax Division, the Criminal Division, the Civil Division, and others.

You will find the Antitrust Division listed as a separate item. The committee has recommended an appropriation of the full amount requested for antitrust activities. The increase is in the amount of \$254,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year. This \$254,000 is merely to provide for mandatory or statutory items such as pay act increases and within grade promotions.

Now we get to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This is the 14th year, as I said a while ago, that this bill has borne my name—in all these years there has not been a 5-cent reduction in the requests for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of this organization, is one of the finest, if not the finest, administrators in the Federal Government. I should like to take this occasion to remind us all of the fact that he took over as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on May 10, 1924. Accordingly, Mr. Hoover will celebrate his 40th anniversary as Director of the agency this coming Sunday and I know we all extend him our compliments and wish him further successes in his position for many years to come.

With regard to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the committee recommends the sum of \$71.1 million. At this point I should like to say that that organization has the greatest Commissioner it has ever had in the course of its existence. Today we find the morale of the people in the Immigration and Naturalization Service who work on immigration and nationality matters and the border patrol down on the Mexican border in the best shape it has ever been.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CELLER. I would say that Ray Farrell, to who you made reference, is a

truly dedicated servant who has done yeoman service in immigration and nationality matters. He has rendered fine work as head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and too much praise cannot be heaped upon him because of this.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. I would like to join the gentleman in his praise of the Commissioner, Mr. Farrell. He is a first-class public servant. I should like to add, however, that the good job Commissioner Farrell is doing was made possible by the really extraordinary job that was done by Joseph Swing, who was his predecessor.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. He is a fine gentleman also.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish to add my word to what has been said about Ray Farrell. I think all of us in Illinois and all of the Members from Illinois, both Republican and Democrat, think he is one of the greatest public servants America has ever had.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I, too, would like to raise my voice to compliment the present Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Ray Farrell. Not only is he a very fine public servant, but his staff in the city of New York is an excellent organization and a very courteous organization to Members of Congress who have occasion to inquire of them and seek their aid and assistance.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Now to get to the Department of Commerce. Let me say that the revised budget request for that department totaled \$911,969,000. The committee included in the bill \$730,086,000, a reduction of \$181,883,000 in the total request and \$74,414,100 below the appropriation for the current fiscal year. The largest decrease, however, \$148,735,000, is in the Area Redevelopment Administration and is due to the fact that legislation authorizing additional appropriations has not yet been enacted by the Congress.

The bill also includes \$3,648 million for the Bureau of Public Roads, which is derived from the highway trust fund. There is not much that the committee can do with regard to money expended out of this trust fund which is generated as the result of the collection of Federal gasoline and excise taxes and is then committed in advance of the time that it

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9897

gets to the committee, for the highway construction program.

I should like to refer to the fact that in the Bureau of the Census the committee considered a \$210,000 supplemental request for the item "Salaries and expenses" for the fiscal year 1964 contained in House Document No. 174 to provide for the collection of additional information on footwear imports. Inasmuch as there is every indication that this bill will not become law before July 1 and that a supplemental appropriation would not become available early enough for the Bureau of the Census to proceed during the present fiscal year which expires on June 30, the supplemental request was not approved.

However, the committee has included \$135,000, the full amount of the request by the Department of Commerce, in the item "Salaries and expenses" to carry out this footwear imports research during fiscal year 1965.

The House of Representatives has already passed the bill making appropriations for the fiscal year 1965 for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and included therein as passed by the House was the full amount, \$88,000, requested by the Bureau of Customs for their activities in connection with this research program.

We have presently on the floor with us the distinguished gentleman and my longtime friend and colleague from Virginia, the Honorable J. VAUGHAN GARY, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, which makes appropriations for the Departments of Treasury and Post Office. I should like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] if it is not the fact, as I have recited, that there is included in the amount for the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, already passed by this House, \$88,000 to specifically carry out the activities of the Bureau of Customs in connection with this footwear research in fiscal year 1965.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my distinguished friend from New York that that is correct. This is a joint enterprise between the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Customs. They have agreed on a distribution of the amount to be appropriated between the two in order that each may bear its proper share of this appropriation. The purpose of the project is to get more accurate figures as a basis upon which those who are negotiating these trade agreements can operate. In our committee we have not only allowed the amount but we actually visited New York to discuss the problems of the Bureau of Customs with them and we viewed this activity while we were there.

We were convinced that it was a proper activity and allowed the full amount that they require for the fiscal year 1965.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the distinguished gentleman from New York if he feels that these sums are sufficient to carry out the recommendations of the late beloved

John F. Kennedy in conducting this research?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If I were to answer that question honestly I would have to say that we may have included too much in this bill for that purpose. The gentleman realizes that they asked for \$210,000 in the fiscal year 1964. This bill carries \$223,000 for customs and commerce.

Mr. BURKE. I realize how prudent is the gentleman from New York. I want to point out to the gentleman that we are appreciative of the amount that he has in this bill. Also we wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee for Post Office and Treasury for the amount included there. We feel that this is sufficient from the information we have received from the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Customs. We thank each of these gentlemen.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, permit me to tell the gentleman from Massachusetts where we get our information. We received the figure from the Bureau of Census for \$135,000, which they say they need, for their part of this research. From the Bureau of Customs we have a figure of \$88,000 which they say they need. We did not just take these figures out of the air.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that and I compliment the gentleman for the fine job he is doing. I know that the footwear people of America are thankful to him and to the 235 Members of the House who signed the petition asking for these sums.

Mr. Chairman, I say again that we thank him as do the employees in the footwear industry of America as well as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am now hoping and praying that with the expenditure of this \$223,000 the American taxpayer will benefit, and that the research will produce something which will be of consequence both to the taxpayer and to the shoe industry.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield further to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, may I say that this gathering of more accurate statistics, not only relates to the shoe industry but relates to many other industries in the United States. Our committee was convinced, and certainly hope, that the expenditure of the funds will inure to the benefit of practically all the taxpayers of the United States rather than to any particular industry.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am in thorough agreement with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia in his allowance of \$88,000 for the imported shoe research program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I am a little surprised that the citizen from Massachusetts, Mr. Herter, is not more interested in the shoe industry and in a great many other

industries that are being deflated by virtue of foreign imports.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I suspect that he really is.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I question that.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I want to say that the purpose of collecting the statistics is to give Mr. Herter more accurate information upon which to conduct his negotiations. I believe they will be of great help to Mr. Herter and his entire program, as well as the industries affected.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, as I understand it, this information will also be gathered for the benefit of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to express my appreciation on behalf of the congressional district it is my privilege to represent of the gentleman's efforts along this line. As the gentleman knows, the largest single employer in my district is the shoe industry.

I thank the gentleman from New York for all that he has done to give us this survey of statistics on imports. The gentleman has done a very fine job and we are all most appreciative. I hope that out of it will come some benefit.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I might remark to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire, that this is the first observation I have had of the distinguished gentleman's interest in Government spending.

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I am very interested in Government spending, but on the conservative side.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, on the minus side.

Mr. WYMAN. That is right in the sense that I believe that unless we are confronted with a national emergency the Government should not spend more than it receives in revenues, particularly with a national debt of \$315 billion. I think Congress should make such a policy mandatory.

The shoe statistical study should help to protect this important domestic industry against the floods of cheap foreign imports by furnishing a firm foundation for relief by executive action through quota limitations. It will help to prove to the doubting Thomases that a huge domestic industry and tens of thousands of American jobs are at stake.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, continuing, we now come to an item in the Department of Commerce budget entitled "U.S. Travel Service." The committee has allowed \$3 million for their activities in fiscal year 1965 which represents a decrease of \$950,000 in the amount of the budget request.

Mr. Chairman, I might say in passing in connection with this outfit that in all my years of experience this has been about the worst-run agency I have ever

come across in Government. This is the outfit, without any authority in law, that went out and bought ladies' bracelets and men's cuff links to give away free of charge to representatives of travel agencies, and so forth. This is the agency that I pointed out a year ago or even 2 years ago which was making illegal contracts with Madison Avenue advertising firms. Since I made these statements with regard to this agency, the Comptroller General's office has found that the purchase of the cuff links and bracelets was strictly illegal and that its contracts running into millions of dollars with Madison Avenue advertising concerns, privately negotiated, were illegal.

Now, gentlemen, I think that the action of the committee in reducing this request—since there is no proof that this agency even with the past expenditure of funds has succeeded in increasing foreign travel to the United States—was proper. As far as I can see, the increases in travel since it has been in existence would have happened anyhow in the normal course of the annual increases in travel, both out of the United States and into the United States.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the items for the National Bureau of Standards I should like to point out that the committee has stated that none of the funds requested for the so-called civilian industrial technology program has been approved. The direct request for such funds was denied by the Congress last year and any and all attempts to obtain such funds by reorganization, diffusion, or attempted confusion must now be clearly unsuccessful.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. As the gentleman knows, I am in complete agreement with this language of the report. So that we may make the record clear, this means none of these funds are to be used for any of those that are set up in the civilian technology part last year except the completion of the textile industry?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct. The new fire research program of last year would be out. Nearly every fire insurance company in America and in that industry has complained about the Government getting into this business. The same refers to the building construction industry as well.

Mr. BOW. To the building construction industry?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. As I understand it, for the U.S. Travel Service the 1964 appropriation was \$2.6 million. Recommended in the bill was \$3 million. Is this the agency the gentleman was referring to?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is. It will now have a new Director.

Mr. FOREMAN. I believe the gentleman stated he did not think we had any increased foreign travel since we had this agency?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We are hoping that maybe with a new Director and these additional moneys the result may be successful.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what else I need to explain in connection with the pending bill. It is a long bill and it refers to many agencies stretched across the Government. The Federal judiciary from the Supreme Court down to the district courts, the referees in bankruptcy, and their expenses, are included. Also included are the U.S. Information Agency, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Tariff Commission, the Subversive Activities Control Board, the Small Business Administration, the Federal Maritime Commission, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the Commission on Civil Rights, and the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions, this concludes my remarks.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

(Mr. LIPSCOMB asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], has covered this bill very adequately. As is generally the case in appropriation measures, there are differences of opinion on this particular bill.

There are some items I would personally have liked to see reduced even more, and there are some items that perhaps we could have raised, which would have been helpful in accomplishing its purposes.

I want to assure my colleagues in the House that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], chairman of the subcommittee, lets very little escape his attention. The same applies to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. Chairman, as so ably explained by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the total amount in the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965, exclusive of the Bureau of Public Roads Trust Fund, is \$1,702,627,800. This amount is \$255,136,900 below the total amount of the budget estimates. However, a large part of this reduction in the amount of \$148,325,000 is due to the fact that no added authorization exists for the Rural Redevelopment Administration and new legislation has not been enacted into law.

The amount provided in this bill for fiscal year 1965 is \$135,839,200 below the total appropriated to date for the current fiscal year.

The President requested a total of \$42,675,000 for fiscal year 1964 supple-

mental items of which only \$450,000 is approved by the committee.

The principal supplemental items requested by the President and disapproved by the committee included \$25 million request for education and cultural exchange with Japan; \$12 million request for preservation of ancient Nubian monuments; and \$5 million request for State Department communications.

As is generally the case in appropriation bills, there are differences of opinion in regard to various items and amounts contained in the overall bill. This bill is no exception. There are items I would like to see reduced or even eliminated. There are items that additional amounts could well be used to advantage. However, after numerous days and hours of hearings, listening to scores of witnesses, the bill before the House today represents the considered judgment of the subcommittee. From my experience as a member of the subcommittee I can assure you that my colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the chairman of the subcommittee, lets very little escape his attention and I can say the same for the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

With a few exceptions, principally the amount recommended for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the continued and expanding of requests for international organization, I am in support of this bill, H.R. 11134.

Mr. Chairman, time does not permit a detailed analysis of the bill item by item. The report accompanying the bill covers the items very well. There are some comments I would like to make on a few matters of concern to me.

However, before proceeding to these matters, I would like to commend the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, who will, on May 10, observe his 40th anniversary of his elevation to his post. And his associates for the fine manner in which they perform their responsibilities in administering this great Bureau. If every agency presented its budget justifications and documented the background to support its requests as effectively and efficiently as Mr. Hoover and his associates, there would be fewer questions raised as to the quality and accuracy of the various budget requests before us today. The committee's confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation is reflected by the fact that we have again recommended the full FBI budget request in the amount of \$150,445,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. Chairman, the total amount recommended in this bill for the Department of State is \$343,837,000. This amount is an increase of \$2,767,000 over the total for this Department in the current fiscal year and is a reduction of \$57,875,000 below the proposed budget estimates.

This reduction is both reasonable and necessary. Reasonable in a sense that it will not harm any operation or function which the Department of State is performing, and necessary in the sense that it is our committee and this body

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9899

as a whole which have the responsibility of imposing certain curbs necessary to prevent unnecessary spending and growth which would otherwise take place in such a large and bureaucratic organization.

It is not enough to look at the total dollars being proposed in this bill for the Department of State, but rather how these dollars will be used in the interest of the people and as intended by Congress when it appropriated the funds. Based on some past performances of our Department of State, the funds, even with the reduction recommended, may be excessive, if past performance and results are any criteria.

It would be irresponsible on our part, however, to reduce this budget to an unreasonably low figure because of present policies and administrative actions.

We need a strong State Department, particularly nowadays in these troubled times. There are within the agency fine, competent, dedicated Federal servants who deserve our wholehearted support. The answer is not a simple one which says we can cut so many dollars in order to produce an effective, coordinated Department of State geared for efficient operation for the formulation and execution of the foreign policy of the United States.

It is apparent, in my opinion, that the Department of State needs a complete reorganization of the whole machinery from top to bottom. The apparent layer upon layer of officials, the numerous committees, the interrelation with other agencies such as the Defense Department, the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency, Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and so forth, create at best a completely unwieldy situation. The wonder is that any policy can be implemented at all.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to cite some examples in our foreign policy that are being practiced by our State Department which prompted these remarks.

A few weeks ago the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House released the hearings entitled "Winning the Cold War: the U.S. Ideological Offensive." In part 7 there is a report, submitted by the Department of State, which gives an accounting of what has happened in the cold war for the past 3 years. The general conclusion cited by the Department of State is:

Overall, there appear to have been larger gains than losses for the free world. The major U.S. confrontations with the Soviet Union have turned out favorably.

The report then goes on to cite the major United States-Soviet confrontations which occurred during this period which they interpret as being failures to the Soviet bloc and therefore victories for our side. These victories consist of:

1. The confrontation in 1961: "with Soviet and East German efforts to reduce or eliminate the Western Allies' position in Berlin."

In this area the State Department concludes that:

Access to Berlin was maintained, the Soviets did not sign a peace treaty with East Germany, and the allied military presence

remained intact. The principal change was the building of the wall between East and West Berlin, a practical aid to the security of the East German regime but a public admission of failure for Ulbricht and the whole Communist camp.

Mr. Chairman, since we are in Berlin by right and are living up to the agreements of the treaty, to say that merely maintaining this position is a victory really stretches the imagination. This is the type of response and behavior which should be commonplace in our foreign affairs. To go on, however, and say that the wall is a victory for us is flagrant distortion—it points up the impotence of our State Department policy in allowing this to happen which is a direct affront to our position and to our allies, the West German people.

Second. The second Communist failure, or our victory, was the Soviet failure in their effort to undermine the functioning of the United Nations Secretary General by the "troika" proposal. Again, the "troika" concept was completely contrary to the existing U.N. agreement and we merely defended the status quo. However, I wonder if there were any concessions made in order to achieve this end.

Third. The third Communist failure and U.S. victory was the removal of: "Offensive missiles in Cuba in October 1962."

It is admitted that this was a good and proper move on our part. I do believe, however, that it cannot be accepted as a substantial victory because on one hand we allowed this to happen and on the other we now have a Communist state existing 90 miles from our shores which was not there before.

As a clear indication of our State Department orientation to such matters as this, there is a statement in the report relative to the Cuban situation as follows:

Although Cuba has become a Communist state, it is well to remember that the Communists, far from playing a major part in the success of the Castro revolution, were as surprised as we by the turn of events in that country in the period 1959.

There are times I am sure when each of us has difficulty in finding words to express a particular situation. After the statement I just quoted, I am afraid I am in that position.

Fourth. The fourth Soviet failure, and again I presume U.S. victory, was the nuclear test ban treaty agreement. The State Department reasoning is:

The United States succeeded in bringing Moscow to accept terms that it had turned down when we offered them previously.

This is certainly a true statement, as far as it goes, but like many things emanating from the State Department it does not go far enough. A review of the negotiations shows that we altered our position far more significantly than the Soviets and that the major risks involved in this agreement are being assumed by the United States, not the Soviet Union.

The above four "victories" are what our State Department summarizes as their major successes of the past 3 years. If these represent "major victories," and we have had only four, even of this kind,

you can readily see why our foreign affairs have deteriorated.

Mr. Chairman, these are only a few examples to illustrate the fallacious reasoning which our State Department is utilizing in U.S. foreign policy. I believe the above illustrations are sufficient to illustrate the gravity of the situation.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The upward trend in contributions to 32 international organizations is continuing for fiscal year 1965.

The total contained in the bill for contributions to international organizations to meet obligations not otherwise provided for is \$87,168,000.

This amount represents a decrease from the current fiscal year, estimated at \$99,679,000, only because it does not include appropriations for the United Nations Congo operation and the working capital fund as was the case last year.

Increased appropriations were requested in effect for the United Nations, and for all but one of the U.N. specialized agencies. This includes the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organizations, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Labor Organization, and the International Tele-Communication Union, and for the Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

There are also increased requests for a good share of the inter-American regional and other international organizations for which appropriations are contained in this section of the bill.

The Appropriations Committee report on this bill for fiscal year 1963, 2 years ago, stated that the cost of U.S. membership in international organizations had nearly doubled in the previous 5 years and stated that efforts must be made to hold the annual budget in line.

Last year for the fiscal year 1964 budget the committee report again carried an expression of concern over the increasing cost of our membership in international organizations and called for renewed efforts.

In this year's report you will find the following language:

Except for isolated instances, the requests for the various organizations are larger than for the current fiscal year. The committee has repeatedly admonished the responsible officials of the Department of State to make every effort to see that our annual contributions to these organizations are held to a minimum. The results to date have been most discouraging.

Despite claims by State Department spokesmen to the effect that an economy move was underway, when the details of the budget were actually discussed during the hearings most of the items came up as proposals for an increase in the U.S. contributions.

Mr. Chairman, I feel quite sure that the fact that the Appropriations Committee has called for a tightening down on expenditures in this area has had helpful effects. But I am also completely convinced that a lot more should and could be done.

In the area of international organizations, potential exists for expenditures to really get out of hand and our representatives must get used to speaking more forcefully and effectively in behalf of the U.S. taxpayer. Our representatives must cease pushing for new, expanded activities by these international organizations. We should also have a halt in what seems to have been involved all too often over the years and that is the tendency to commit the United States in advance. In such cases the committee is presented with claims that, if the appropriations are not granted, we would be backing down on our word, that our prestige would suffer, and so forth. For the Appropriations Committee to be presented with such situations makes a mockery of the appropriations process.

The overall financial situation in the United Nations continues to be open to serious question. At the end of 1963, the United Nations had a net deficit of \$130.7 million, as compared with a net deficit of \$72.4 million at the end of 1962, representing an increase of approximately \$58 million for the year. This, however, excludes unpaid balances on United Nations bonds, the United States loan for the United Nations building, and credits due on transfer of League of Nations assets, which it is estimated amount to over \$190 million additional debt.

The United Nations general fund was in arrears to the tune of \$20.8 million as of December 31, 1963, as compared with arrears of \$17.8 million the year previously.

Included in the U.N. deficit is the continuing indebtedness to the United States for supplies and services the United Nations received from the U.S. Department of Defense. These supplies and services were rendered mainly for the United Nations Congo operation, and include a small amount for the United Nations Emergency Force in its Middle East peacekeeping operations.

As of December 31, 1963, the amount owing the United States by the United Nations in connection with its peacekeeping operations was \$33,304,000, which included amounts billed to the U.N. but unpaid, unbilled amounts, and estimated amounts being or to be performed by the Department of Defense for the United Nations. While a \$7.3 million repayment was made by the U.N. in January of this year, these debts have been owing for a long time and it is time they are completely paid up.

It is difficult to know at this point whether or to what extent supplies and services are being furnished to the United Nations by the Department of Defense relating to the Cyprus situation which would further increase the size of the tab picked up by the American taxpayer, but it is a matter that must be watched closely.

We have no new information, according to testimony presented at the hearings, concerning the use and control of the jeeps in Cuba supplied by the Pan American Health Organization. Lack of information concerning activities to which we contribute, lack of control, and related problems such as the need for

improved coordinating and direction of our overall effort in the area of international organizations continues to be one of the serious shortcomings. There is no reason why our Nation should contribute the lion's share year after year and not assume a commensurate role in directing policy and operations.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. Chairman, there is included in this bill the sum of \$11 million for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This is a substantial increase of \$3,500,000 over the current fiscal year funds. The increase is primarily for outside contract research.

In my opinion this substantial increase is too large and the amount could well be reduced. A reduction would not harm the program and the Agency's growth would develop in a more stabilized manner. On the surface an \$11 million total request does not appear too unreasonable, though a 46-percent increase in 1 year certainly is significant and unusual.

This is not the complete picture of our Government's arms control and disarmament activity as many people believe. There is significantly more activity being performed outside of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that must be weighed in when we consider their budget requests. Specifically requested for fiscal year 1965 in the arms control and disarmament field for outside contracts are the following:

Arms Control and Disarmament Agency-----	\$7,400,000
Atomic Energy Commission-----	500,000
Department of Defense-----	660,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration-----	140,000
U.S. Information Agency—total amount not available, but probably upward of-----	200,000

This totals close to \$9 million. In addition, there is Project Vela, for which funds for 1965 include \$2,500,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission and \$60,900,000 for the Department of Defense. The admitted grand total therefore is over \$72 million for arms control and disarmament requested for fiscal year 1965.

And that is not all. The above figures were supplied to the committee as a result of questioning, but they do not appear to be complete. Specifically, in the Department of Defense 1965 fiscal year budget it is known that in addition to the \$660,000 mentioned above there is at least \$3 million more for Project Cloud Gap which is an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency test program. While on the subject of the Department of Defense I should like to point out an inconsistency. During the Department of Defense hearings the question was asked of that agency as to how much contract activity they have in this field. They responded \$3 million for Project Cloud Gap and \$275,000 for other studies. You can see none of these figures can be correlated with the figures supplied by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In addition, there is \$203,000 included in the Department of State 1965 budget for the 18 Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva. There are also activities in the arms control and disarma-

ment area going on in the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It should be borne in mind that these figures mentioned are the outside contracts for research and besides this there is work being done in-house in the various agencies and bureaus.

In order to complete the fiscal picture I believe it is necessary to quickly summarize the amounts of funds already committed in this same contracts area. The report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency submitted to the Bureau of the Budget as of March 15, 1964, shows the following: These dollars, I should point out, reflect programs that were completed, initiated, or active during the period June 1 to November 1963. We can assume, therefore, that it is not complete as of this date and the figures are probably now much higher.

Arms Control and Disarmament Agency-----	\$3,400,000
Department of Defense-----	614,000
Joint Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and Department of Defense-----	1,442,000
Atomic Energy Commission-----	17,399,000
Department of Commerce—no dollars available-----	
U.S. Information Agency-----	194,000
Department of Labor—no dollars available-----	
Project Vela: Department of Defense, \$52,000,000; Atomic Energy Commission, \$6,100,000-----	58,100,000

The above figures add up to over \$81 million. Therefore, if you consider the fiscal year 1965 requests and those funds already committed there is over \$150 million allocated to arms control and disarmament activities, not counting the in-house effort of these Departments and Agencies.

In view of the above extensive effort, which in itself is questionable, the increased request of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency does not appear to be warranted. My position is also being influenced by the apparent lack of forthrightness on the presentation in some of these figures.

As I have stated before on the subject of appropriations, dollars themselves are not the whole criteria for how well or effectively a particular agency or department performs or can perform. It is true this agency is new, but nevertheless they hold a most vital position in our Government due to the nature of their assignment. They have used the recent test ban agreement as the epitome of their success in their field of arms control and disarmament. Among us are those who favored this test ban and those who opposed it, but I believe this agreement was entered into with the United States taking most, if not all, the risks. That it was we who moved the farthest from our original starting position. Only history will be able to say finally whether or not this was a truly significant achievement by this Agency. I prefer to hold reservations about its classification. Another aspect that disturbs me about this agreement is that it was virtually fait accompli before it was introduced in the Senate. There were a few who opposed it, but a climate had been

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9901

developed and nurtured by this Agency so that the legislative branch practically had no choice. Whether the particular instance is considered favorable or unfavorable Congress cannot allow itself to be put in this untenable position.

It should also be particularly noted that during the course of the Defense Department hearings we had a witness from the Joint Chiefs of Staff who was asked if there has been any influence by the Disarmament Agency on the Department of Defense. His answer is as follows:

Well, I do not think they are having any influence yet. The Joint Chiefs are keeping fairly close track on the activities of the Disarmament Agency. One of the things that has worried us in the past and one of the things we have discussed with Mr. Foster is that a lot of proposals come over and we have maybe 12 or 24 hours to comment on very complicated problems. As a matter of fact, I was going to say most, but quite a sizable portion of the proposals they have sent over have not been looked on with very much favor by the Joint Chiefs.

Disarmament is a very, very complicated subject and one you have to watch very carefully. It seems to us that we are making too many proposals. This is my personal opinion, now, that we are making a lot of proposals. We are trying to make progress and giving away a little bit too much, possibly. (Discussion off the record.)

This statement further supports the prudent position of going a bit slower and is one more reason, therefore, for reducing the proposed budget as indicated.

For example, their request included a proposal for new language in the bill to permit \$4,000 for "official reception and representation expenses" which was not approved by the subcommittee and is not included in the bill.

Besides the growth of their contract research, the Agency is coming up with the usual frills which all agencies seem to require in order to expand with prestige.

From July 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency authorized 127 speaking trips by Agency personnel throughout the Nation. Twenty-three were at a cost to the taxpayer for travel expense of \$3,138.71 and 84 were engagements at no travel cost; however, salaries were paid by the taxpayer. For an agency which people like to call a small program, it seems a good share of the time was spent on the road by some of their personnel, for the 7-month period reported in the hearings. I would suggest my colleagues take a look at the list of speaking dates which appear on pages 860-863 of the hearings.

When questioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] about the reasoning for spending taxpayers' money in this fashion, Mr. Foster, Director of the Agency, replied:

Mr. Chairman, that is consistent with one of the four functions with which our Agency is charged; namely, of disseminating information about arms control.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] replied:

Not this way. That is not my understanding. This is about the most expensive list I have seen in any of the agencies in this entire bill as we went through the budget. Do you agree with me, Mr. Bow?

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] answered:
Yes, sir.

A close reading of the hearing would lead you to the conclusion that the total request of \$11 million could be reduced without harm to the program.

In view of what has been pointed out, I question the need for an additional total increase of \$3,500,000 which is proposed in the bill before the House.

It is my hope the subcommittee will follow the activities and growth of this Agency.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. Chairman, during the U.S. Information Agency hearings on their Information Service Center budget request, the question was raised as to the alleged necessity for an increase from \$90,000 to \$195,000 in the coming year for their program entitled "Book Development."

Mr. Reed Harris, Director, Information Service Center, replied as follows:

Mr. HARRIS. That is a program under which we can have books written to our own specifications, books that would not otherwise be put out, especially those books that have strong anti-Communist content, and follow other themes that are particularly useful for our purposes. Under the book development program, we control the thing from the very idea down to the final edited manuscript.

As an example of USIA accomplishment in this type of activity, Mr. Harris called to the attention of the subcommittee a book he had with him on the study of worldwide Communist tactics. USIA paid \$14,952 to have it written, edited, and prepared. According to Mr. Harris, this book was developed at USIA instigation. The book was prepared, according to Mr. Harris, by an:

Organization, as you know, sir, was an organization, I suppose we would call it a Socialist-type organization, that appealed to the leftwing people overseas whom the Communists have been approaching and who have led the fight among the Socialists against the Communists.

Mr. Harris also expressed pleasure with the book on the basis that the book also seems to have come to the attention of people in this country, and has been selected by some for distribution in the United States.

To me this was new information, that the USIA contracted to have books written, edited, and prepared and then turned the publishing rights over to private publishers to sell and distribute in the United States. When I inquired as to how many books the USIA had which were financed by the USIA and are now being put out by American publishers for sale in the United States, Mr. Harris replied:

Sir, that is a slightly difficult question because the books which are developed this way, which we intend primarily for overseas use, are also put out independently by the publishers with whom we have dealings in the United States.

Mr. Louis A. Fanget, Chief, Publications Division, expanded this statement as follows:

Mr. FANGET. Sir, it is our intent to have all the books published by the American publisher for sale commercially not only in

the United States but we hope overseas so that the book has the credibility we want it to have. It is likely in every case the book will be published commercially. However, the copies we would get for use in the program would vary from book to book depending on the support. For example, we have a program where we support book titles on America Today, where we get 4,000 copies for use in the program, and the publisher publishes 5,000 more copies for use in this country. Every book we support is published commercially.

Mr. Chairman, with just a review of these few statements serious questions are raised.

When a Government agency such as the USIA finds that:

There are great advantages in having certain few books prepared for very special specifications because they can get to these foreign people more effectively.

When it is their full intent to have the books published by the American publisher for sale commercially in the United States.

When the USIA must subsidize publishers to get:

A slant that would directly support the foreign policy of the United States in the opinion of the people who have selected these topics.

When the USIA must follow this practice so:

Tailorings permit the insertion of material that is particularly effective in getting support.

When USIA believes the fact that their interest in certain of these books should not become a matter of general public information because it would harm the books, credibility overseas, yet it is USIA's intent to have all the books published by the American publisher for sale commercially in the United States.

Then, Mr. Chairman, USIA, in my opinion, is exceeding the bounds of their authority and directly making an effort to propagandize the American people.

If the American taxpayers are reading books they themselves subsidize with their tax dollars—books which are written, edited and prepared with the proper "slant" to U.S. Information Agency specifications—the taxpayer is entitled to know he is reading Government subsidized material developed specifically for USIA's overseas mission.

The Government, the USIA, and, in fact, the publisher should so designate this fact. In my opinion, the U.S. Information Agency should call a halt to this practice and concentrate on their prime target overseas and not U.S. citizens.

The Honorable Robert J. Manning, Assistant Secretary of Public Affairs, in an address which he made before the National Editorial Association on March 13 of this year, set forth a policy that should be basic. He stated:

The separation of journalism and government is as basic and as advisable as separation of church and state. Government intrusion into the functioning of journalism—whether by censorship, by regulatory controls, by economic penetration, or political manipulation—would represent serious jeopardy to our political system.

The U.S. Information Agency should heed these remarks.

This practice assumes even greater significance and gravity when you also consider the actions of other agencies and departments which parallel these efforts. As already cited on the floor of the House, the Department of Defense controlling news illustrated by the TFX memo of Assistant Secretary of Defense A. Sylvester—the deletions from the appropriations hearings for "political" security reasons—the use of previously classified security information to defend a particular partisan position—the publishing of books from materials originally financed by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, but not so identified—the publishing of a pamphlet by the ARA supporting the ARA position, again without the source being identified. These are just a few examples but I believe they serve to show the scope of the practice and the exceedingly dangerous condition it represents to this legislative body and the American people as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that no part of this appropriation which we are considering today in this bill should be used for the development of books or any other similar material for the USIA worldwide programs which would also be distributed by sale or otherwise within the continental United States.

Mr. Chairman, the questions and objections which I have raised are made to generate concern by all of us in the problems we are facing in the conduct of our affairs and to point up, in my opinion, the questionable policies being pursued by the agencies included in this bill.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. I wish to commend the gentleman on his very good summary of this bill and to join him in many of his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, there are many good and commendable features in this appropriations bill, H.R. 11134. Among those are such efficiently administered departments as the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and others. I commend the committee upon bringing us a bill that is \$135,839,200 less than in fiscal year 1964. This is a good step in the right direction.

However, it is indeed difficult for me to support such increases that are included in this bill such as: \$3,500,000 increase for Arms Control and Disarmament activities; \$400,000 increase for the very badly administered U.S. Travel Service, which department, the chairman of the subcommittee has stated, has served no useful purpose in increasing foreign travelers within our country; \$11,670,000 increase for the State Department, \$10 million of which is an increase for salaries and expenses in this very loosely run Department. Further, this bill includes \$73,500,000 in new appropriations for the Area Redevelopment Administration, an agency that has, in

instance after instance, put folks out of work and business, and has actually helped to create new pockets of poverty rather than eliminating poverty. These kinds of increases and appropriations are not in our overall best interests, and for these reasons I cannot, in good conscience, support this kind of spending program.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state that the gentleman from California who now has the floor is the most conscientious and best informed member of the House Committee on Appropriations. His review of this bill and the points which were just outlined in his remarks today should be heeded by every Member of the House. I commend him on his usual very fine presentation.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman for his usual fine and scholarly work in gathering information. It is a great service for this information to be available to not only the House but to the American public.

I would like to ask if during the course of the hearings any information was brought out which shows that the State Department or the USIA follows the practice of distributing commercially made American films in foreign countries or perhaps in some form subsidizes the distribution of certain select commercially made films in foreign countries. Was there any information revealed along those lines?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. There is a program which is called the Informational Media Guarantee Fund program whereby commercial distributors within the United States distribute films in foreign countries. Because of the lack of foreign exchange the Informational Media Guarantee Fund makes up a certain monetary difference.

Mr. GUBSER. I received a letter from a constituent this morning which made the claim that the film "Seven Days in May" is being distributed in India partially at the expense of the U.S. Government and that one of the leading actors in this film, Mr. Kirk Douglas, is touring India partially at Government expense. I have inquired of the State Department regarding this, and naturally have not had a chance to receive an answer as yet. But I might gratuitously offer the thought that if this is the case, I seriously question if such a film, which does not place our military men in a very fine light, is a proper type of film for distribution in countries like India by the U.S. Government.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the gentleman from California for his comment. I believe the matter the gentleman has

brought to the attention of the House is worth following through on because I have found most anything can happen within this agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I was just reading the hearings and I simply wish to compliment and commend the gentleman from California for calling attention to the great tourist potential of the State of West Virginia when he referred to it as "the Switzerland of America." I want to thank the gentleman for the good advertising which he gave to West Virginia.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I might tell the gentleman that I obtained that quote from a Government-subsidized pamphlet that was being put out without any attribution to the Department of Commerce, or the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Mr. HECHLER. Of course, the gentleman's statement was a 2-day wonder in the newspapers of West Virginia and it was a great boost to our morale. I hope that tourists from many States will visit West Virginia as a result. We appreciate the gentleman's calling attention to it.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I wish you luck. Thank you.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] raised a question about the film "Seven Days in May." I have seen this film, and it is a very fine film. Is there any way we can insure that the exported copies of this film are clearly identified as "fictional"? There have been serious questions raised by individuals seeing this film under the promotion and suggestion of the USIA. It has been misleading, I think, for many foreigners because it has not been clearly labeled. Is there any method by which we could control or help in this problem?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I truthfully know of no method whereby we can control it if it is being distributed by private distributors. I should think they would make an effort themselves, if they are interested in the welfare of America, so to label it. If the Federal Government in any way is subsidizing or moving this film around overseas under any of their programs, I think they would be obligated to point out that the film is fictional.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK].

(Mr. SLACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, the appropriations bill before the House today presents a splendid opportunity to bring forward certain conclusions which I have

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9903

reached during service as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

These major appropriation bills provide the backbone of the work in each congressional session. They are the end product of an enormous amount of the dedicated activity by interested persons on both sides of the aisle.

Very often, as in the case of the bill before us today, there is no great drama involved, and there is no point from which large newspaper headlines can be written. The measure comes to the House simply as a bill of particulars created out of the consensus of the committee members who conducted intensive explorations during hearings which lasted several months. It represents the designated cost of continuing authorized functions of certain Federal agencies for another year.

The proposals contained in a bill of this kind represent nothing more nor less than the same factors each of us must consider individually when we calculate our personal and family expenditures for a particular year. The very absence of headline attention, however, tends to obscure the most important aspect of a bill of this kind.

I refer to the determined effort to provide continuing scrutiny of budget requests, to establish controlled and realistic expenditures as a way of life, without weakening the capacity of the agencies to perform their rightful functions.

One of the great strengths of our system of government is the element of continuity of operational standards which arise out of a necessity for the agencies to justify before the Appropriations Subcommittee the manner in which Federal funds are to be used.

A line must always be drawn between the amount of funds an agency must have to perform successfully and those larger totals which are perhaps not necessary at this time, or are not adequately justified from the standpoint of the taxpayer's interest in sound fiscal practices.

It is frequently a judgment question, and the judgment must be exercised on the basis of past experience. This is true because most funds are requested for continuing programs, but the programs are not always administered by the same men with the same depth of experience and range of convictions. Continuity of purpose and practice must, therefore, be established by those who accept the responsibility of recommending to the Congress the amounts to be appropriated.

The bill before us is an excellent example of a product which has emerged after long and careful consideration in a committee guided by proven experience. In this instance, the experience of Chairman JOHN ROONEY, whose knowledge of the actual needs of agencies and their limitations, provides us with adequate assurance that this is a sound and practical approach to the fiscal requirements of these agencies for the next year.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. Do I understand that this Government tossed \$82,000 into a mountain-climbing expedition, the excuse being that the funds were available and ought to be spent? Does the gentleman recall that?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has read the printed hearings correctly. Of course, they never asked the committee for the money for this particular purpose but they did use funds for such purpose in their educational exchange activity.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman and the members of his committee for the job they did in this regard. They served notice in the hearings that they did not look kindly upon expenditures for this purpose; is that not correct?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I beg the gentleman's pardon; what was his question?

Mr. GROSS. I say that the committee made it plain that the members of the committee and of the Congress did not look favorably upon the use of money for this purpose for the reasons given.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot help asking how much was spent on Secretary of the Interior Udall's mountain climbing of Mount Fuji in Japan.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is quite a feat to climb Fuji. Has the gentleman ever attempted it?

Mr. GROSS. No. Has the gentleman from New York ever attempted it?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I just looked at it. To me it looks like a big beautiful ball of vanilla ice cream.

Mr. GROSS. I have never seen it. If my memory serves me correctly, an Australian or a New Zealand mountain climber was on the Interior Department payroll a year or so ago as some kind of teacher of mountain climbing.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman if we have had any more Tom Two Feathers?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That was Tom Two Arrows.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Two Arrows.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. And then he had an alias, as I recall—what was that? Does the gentleman from Iowa recall? I think we discussed Tom about 10 years ago.

Mr. GROSS. No, it has been more recent than 10 years ago. But I do notice that the Government has had on the payroll a Jazzy Cole or a Cozy Cole revue, or something of that kind.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Would that be Cozy Cole?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know who he is. I do not believe he was identified.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I must confess that I am not as thoroughly con-

versant with these theatrical performers as is the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am relying upon the gentleman's hearings to some extent.

And, then, I suppose Martha Graham's dancers have been taken out of circulation, have they not? They are no longer parading them around the world at a cost of thousands of dollars? That comedian that got us into trouble over in the Far East—I have forgotten his name—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Please do not mention his name. He has been hit over the head often enough.

Mr. GROSS. And, somewhere—I guess it was in your hearings—I read or heard that the reception for Jose Limon—is that the way you pronounce it?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I believe it is.

Mr. GROSS. Cost some 10 or 12 diplomatic posts more than \$2,000 for receptions for his entertainment when he was sent about the world.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, they want to keep the dancers in a fluid State.

Mr. GROSS. Now I want to go back to the business of lecturers on the Federal payroll, if I may, for just a minute. I believe the hearings relating to this are found on page 1065—but before I do that is the gentleman from New York and his committee still having problems with Foreign Service officers who are brought back to Washington and who are unassigned? I know he has been working on this problem for several years.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes; and we have discussed it here a number of times and previously reported that we found they had as many as 40 or 50 high-cost Foreign Service officers on a definite day who were being paid at rates for duty overseas but back here in Washington at the State Department and USIA. Sad to relate, this situation has not been entirely cured, for it is only within the last few days I learned that they categorized these idle, unassigned Foreign Service officers who are brought back to the State Department in Washington. They are known officially as the "loose pack".

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say "loose pack"?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Loose as can be.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am afraid that is a part of the State Department operations in all too many cases.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, they have too many in the loose pack and we are doing the best we can to rectify the situation.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I hope he stays with this problem, no matter by what name it is called. I do not know how many pages there are here—I have not counted them, but there must be 15 pages in fine print—of lecturers that we are apparently paying salaries and transporting all over the world. I understand there were 876 of them in 1963 and the committee made a whopping cut to 862 for fiscal year 1965. I would be glad to be corrected

if I am wrong. For instance, there was someone from the Juilliard School of Music in New York. She is lecturing on piano at the University of Chile. Then, there is an assistant professor of business administration from the University of California. He is lecturing on marketing in France. I hope that he tells them that we do not like what is going on over in the Common Market. I hope he can lend something to the settlement of the chicken war.

Then, there is a lecturer from Washington, D.C., who is over at the University of Leiden in the Netherlands lecturing on Soviet law.

There is another lecturer, a professor of Greek at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania, who is over at the University of Oxford lecturing on the Greek tragedy.

There is a professor of poultry science at Purdue University who is in the United Kingdom lecturing on population dynamics and genetics. I do not know what a professor of poultry science has to do with population dynamics and genetics. Maybe that, too, is related to chickens.

There is a professor from the University of Illinois lecturing in Russia on agricultural economics. Whether he has been helping them get their wheat from us or just what his mission, I do not know.

Then there is a member of the staff of the Housing and Home Finance Agency who is over in Australia lecturing on urban renewal. I suppose he can give the Australians a nice hand on that. I only hope we are not called on to put up the money for Australia's urban renewal.

Here is an assistant conductor of a little orchestra society in New York over in the Republic of China lecturing on music. There are scores of others, too numerous to mention, including India and Japan which has apparently been saturated with American lecturers. I hope the committee will take a long and hard look at this expenditure. The failure to cut much deeper in many items of this bill will cause me to vote against it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me. I take this time to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], about the controversy surrounding the administration's request for \$12 million for the rescue of the ancient temples at Abu Simbel that are doomed to drowning once the flooding from Aswan Dam is complete. As I understand it, the administration asked for \$12 million as the U.S. share of the \$36 million United Nations fund to rescue these ancient temples from destruction.

I am wondering what consideration led the distinguished committee to deny the administration's request?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think the gentleman from New York should be very readily able to ascertain the answer to that himself. This item was denied and such denial was approved without objection by the full committee. The full committee consists of 50 members.

I should not talk too much about these temples. Suffice it to say that we had allegedly cultured people up here who did not know whether Abu Simbel was an early Egyptian ruler or a place.

The committee evidently just does not think that we should spend \$12 million of valuable currency which we receive at face value. The British, according to the New York Times of Monday, May 4, made their contribution to the temples at Abu Simbel, but in the following manner.

The New York Times of that date said:

The problem arose after the death of Sir Robert Greg, the former British Commissioner for the Egyptian Public Debt, at his home in Cairo in 1953. He left about \$188,000 to be shared by the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge and the National Art Collections Fund. But for 10 years the Egyptian Government refused to release the funds.

After protracted argument, the governments reached an agreement. Last week the Foreign Office (British) sent out check for £33,515 17s. 6d. each for the Fitzwilliam Museum and the NACF.

Then it informed President Nasser that he could regard the money as Britain's official contribution toward saving the Abu Simbel temples from the advancing waters of the Aswan Dam.

Let me say to the gentleman from New York that this is another instance where the British are far smarter than we are. I think their pledge was in the amount of nearly a quarter of a million dollars. They settled it for \$188,000 in wooden money while we are fools enough to offer to contribute \$12 million, one-third of the total cost.

Mr. LINDSAY. Was the \$12 million supposed to be funded out of counterpart funds?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The proposal was to fund them out of the proceeds of Public Law 480 sales of agricultural commodities.

Mr. LINDSAY. Was the committee unanimous in the decision not to recommend the appropriation?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There was no action except in favor of taking it out completely in the full committee.

Mr. LINDSAY. The subcommittee had approved this amount?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It had not approved it.

Mr. LINDSAY. What was the testimony in support of the appropriation?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If the gentleman will refer to the printed Department of State hearings, he will find that the committee went into the matter in some detail, starting at page 1236 of the Department of State hearings. There is a list at page 1243 in which the gentleman may be interested, as well as one on page 1249. It occurs to the present speaker that the United States is being asked to contribute an inordinate amount, to wit, \$12 million, as compared with \$210,000 for the United Kingdom, which the British Foreign Office has just settled for wooden money to the tune of \$188,000. France has agreed to contribute only \$1 million toward saving these temples. I am not too concerned that these temples might be inundated by the waters created as the result of Khrushchev building the

Aswan Dam, and I think the people in my district feel the same way.

Mr. LINDSAY. Did the testimony indicate that in the absence of this \$12 million the temples would not be saved, or is there still some hope that they will be rescued from flooding in the absence of this appropriation?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, Mr. Nasser can proceed to move at any time to save his temples. How does the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] feel about this requested appropriation?

Mr. LINDSAY. I regard these temples as a worldwide heritage. I think they ought to be saved. It is neither an Egyptian nor a national matter. It is international.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Does the gentleman think they ought to be saved with American taxpayers' money?

Mr. LINDSAY. I would agree with the gentleman that it should not be the United States obligation to save them. We should only carry a fair share.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. May I remind the distinguished gentleman from New York that this is the very project that the late Aly Khan, the great international playboy, was concerned with. This is the project on which he was supposed to travel all over the world and collect funds to save these temples. I might say to the gentleman that I have some highly cultured people, Egyptologists, if you please, who feel that this project ab initio should have been carried out by private subscription and not with the Government's, the taxpayers', money.

Mr. LINDSAY. The question I was leading up to was. Would some sum short of \$12 million be an appropriate share on the part of the United States?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think it would only disrupt the arrangement. I think the way to handle the matter is to take the action suggested by the committee and leave it to Mr. Nasser.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman and his committee struck the \$12 million out of this bill, and for the added reason that our share of \$12 million was what UNESCO said we must put into it, according to your hearings. Why should UNESCO tell us what we have to put into a deal of this kind or any other deal?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am afraid the fault lies with the educational and cultural people in the Department of State. This proposal was made before the present Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs took his office. The fault lies with the State Department originally going into these sort of agreements and committing us beforehand to unusual and lopsided sums such as the one we are talking about here.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9905

Mr. Chairman, I rise to defend a great American, a distinguished former Member of this House, a former Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and former Secretary of State of the United States and the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, the Honorable Christian A. Herter. The gentleman from Iowa referred to the poultry war—the chicken war. I should like to report to the gentleman from Iowa, if he does not already know so, that it is shown at page 921 of the printed hearings that Chris Herter retaliated against the French and Germans by recommending to the President increases in the tariffs on four different items—brandy, buses, starches and one other item which escapes me at the moment. He recommended that on these four items we should set up tariff restrictions to the amount of \$26 million which would offset the amount that these countries who opposed us in the so-called poultry war gained by refusing us the opportunity to sell our chickens.

Mr. GROSS. That is only the hope of Christian Herter according to your hearings, that we are going to get this offset. He does not promise us anything or assure us of anything.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I consider Christian Herter's remarks insofar as action on these items is concerned to mean that it is a fait accompli and that we were going to collect the \$26 million in taxes as a result.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New York in the hearings indicated his doubt that Herter is going to get this offset. Moreover, Herter raised the tariff on the highest priced brandy, as I understand it, that France makes. How many people are going to pay that price for a bottle of French brandy in this country?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think that is the problem. But if I know the American public, they are going to cut down on their after-dinner brandy. If this tariff is put on brandy, it will be an offset against the chicken loss.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address one question to the distinguished gentleman from New York in the interest of the legislative history. The gentleman from California spoke about the USIA bookwriting process and the subsequent profit arrangement for the distribution of these books. Does the gentleman from New York who so ably chairs this committee think this bookwriting process is wise in the first instance; or that it is legal?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think that is a matter for the General Accounting Office to decide. I expect they will soon decide this. It is my understanding that the basic law does not permit the U.S. Information Agency to conduct on any propaganda activities aimed at the American public.

With that in mind, the gentleman can readily ascertain my mentality with regard to this situation.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Generally, I have spoken on this bill prior to this time during debate in previous years, but the bill has been so well covered that I shall have little more to say about it. I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has done an excellent job in explaining the bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] covered many important matters in the bill.

I rise simply to say that I support the bill in its entirety as it comes to the floor. I believe it is a good bill. A great deal of work has been done on it. There are some compromises in some places, where I believe further cuts could have been made, and perhaps there are some places where we have cut a little deep. But, of course, all of this can be worked out.

The gentleman from Iowa was concerned about lecturers who have been going around the world speaking at various colleges throughout the world. I would invite the attention of the committee to the volume of testimony on the Department of Justice, page 331, on which there is a listing of colleges of the United States which also have lecturers on their campuses. This is a listing of Communists who have been speaking on the campuses of colleges of the United States. It would seem to me to be of interest to the Members to take a look at this to learn of the colleges in this country which are permitting known and leading Communists to come to speak to the student bodies.

I am as much concerned, and perhaps more so, about this as I am about lecturers who have gone abroad to speak on some of the ridiculous things the gentleman from Iowa pointed out.

I believe the gentleman from New York overlooked one important aspect of the bill. We have seen a new definition arise, I believe, on a question involving the Department of Justice. That is shown on page 247 of the hearings. It relates to the Bureau of Prisons.

As Members know, we have spent a lot of money to build a new prison in the State of Illinois, at Marion. This is supposed to be a top security prison, to take the place of Alcatraz.

The gentleman from New York, in his usual prodding manner, asked about escapes there. He asked, about Marion, "How many escapes did you have?"

It was very interesting that we were told there had been no escapes at the Marion prison, but I ask Members to listen to what was said by the witness:

We have not had more, I think, than perhaps 5 or 6 walkaways; no escapes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY then said:

In other words, if they walk away, it is not an escape. Is that the idea?

So we have a new definition. If the prisoners in that great total security prison merely walk away—and they have had some do so—that is not an escape but just a walkaway.

The gentleman from New York brought that out clearly in regard to the

question of escapes from this total security prison.

On the question of the monuments, I believe the gentleman has been more than fair in his discussion of the matter. I would say, in defense of the committee, that some of us on it were quite strongly opposed to the monuments and to the spending of \$12 million for the purpose requested. I know the feeling of the gentleman from New York about this. Others of us were even stronger in our feelings about this matter, feeling that many other countries are paying only a small amount—the rich oil countries, the Arab countries Mr. Nasser is now going into—and that they can certainly pay a great deal more for the preservation of these monuments than we should be called upon to pay.

I should like to point out that though the counterpart funds are generated under Public Law 480, they cost us dollars just the same. I believe that too many people at times are led to believe that counterpart funds are a Mickey Mouse sort of money and that they do not mean anything. They do. Believe me when I say that when we get counterpart funds we pay 100 cents on the dollar. They are important. We can use them for the operation of our embassies abroad. I do not believe that we should be lulled into the idea that many people have, that merely because we have counterpart funds available we should use them for any purpose which might come along, in this manner. I believe that other countries should be contributing more.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Would my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, agree with me that if we had a more sensible agreement made by the Department of State in this particular instance with the United Arab Republic, we could sell these Egyptian pounds generated by the Public Law 480 program for American dollars?

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is correct, and I brought this out in the hearings, as the record will show. I asked why we could not sell these pounds to people who might be interested in preserving them, even if we did this at some discount. Let private investors come in who would be interested in preserving these monuments. When you think of the great sums of money that museums have available to them in America, this occurs to you. I am a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and I am very interested in this work. I know there are many groups in this country who can raise great amounts of money in the private sector for things of this nature. Why do we have to come to the Federal Government for all of these things when we recognize that we have a \$315 billion deficit and at the end of this year we will have a further deficit and will have gone further into debt? If you got \$12 million, of course, you

9906

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 6

would have to borrow more money to get the funds out of the Treasury.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for pointing up the issue here very clearly, as he has. I might allude to the sale of surplus grain under the Public Law 480 program in generating local currencies in these various countries, because next week when the agriculture appropriation bill comes onto the floor of this House, Members will be called upon to appropriate several hundreds of millions of dollars to replenish the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation because of those sales that were made from local currencies which in effect we cannot use for any other purpose other than some function such as this might be, if it could be done.

I want to ask the gentleman one question: Since this was a \$12 million item request, was there any thought given at all to a token contribution of something less than that \$12 million?

Mr. BOW. No, because just as in other things they said that this is supposed to be the amount of money we are to pay. I do not think we should get into that system of making token contributions. When we deny it, we serve notice on the State Department that we do not approve of it and it is too much. Let them go back and renegotiate with the other countries. If we give a token sum to them, it is just getting the camel's nose under the tent. We should not allow that and should wait until they come back with a proper agreement.

If I have one more minute, I would like to say what the gentleman from New York said; namely, that this was done before the present Assistant Secretary for Cultural Affairs, Mr. Battle, was in office, is so. I would like to observe that Mr. Battle, as the Assistant Secretary for Cultural Affairs, is doing one of the best jobs in the 14 years that I have been serving on this committee that I have ever seen done in this field. He is trying to straighten out that division and is doing an excellent job and, given a little more time, there will be some more improvement.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. First I would like to agree completely with what the distinguished gentleman has said about Mr. Battle. He is a first-class public servant and is doing a very fine job.

Correct me if I am wrong in this: Do I understand that the United Nations set aside a total of \$36 million for the preservation of the temples? That was my understanding of it.

Mr. BOW. This is correct.

Mr. LINDSAY. Having done that, is not the United States rightfully called upon to contribute some share of the \$36 million? That share could be less than \$12 million and it could be less than \$10 million or less than \$5 million, but would not the United States in all good faith

have to support the United Nations in making some contribution?

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the United Nations having done this, in the contributions we make to the United Nations, we have already American taxpayers contributing to this. We are being called on now for this additional amount. I do not think that we should have any token appropriation but should have an understanding as to what it will be and then make it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Apropos of my earlier remarks that I had conversed with people on whose judgment I would rely and became convinced that this should be entirely a matter of private subscription, I would like to join right now with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] in starting a drive for private subscriptions to save the temples at Abu Sinbel. I will be the first to contribute \$50 toward the gentleman's collection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise on this occasion to compliment the action of the committee with regard to this item. I want to say, though, with regard to Public Law 480, as one who helped to sponsor the original bill, that in my judgment the original intent, to a very large degree, has been perverted. In its original state the bill had a pretty good motive. We were looking forward to the eventual reduction and if possible elimination of surpluses so that we could be rid of this very expensive program. In the beginning the Department of State opposed it. Suddenly they concluded that this was about the best cold war weapons anybody could think of and they immediately embraced it. Today they are running the show. They want us to continue to generate surpluses so that they can continue to use them all over the world as a boondoggle program. I do not approve the way they have used these funds in many instances. Of course I think it has done some good. I believe everybody would concur in that opinion.

But we have run into so many instances where there is really not too much justification for the way they have permitted these surpluses to be traded for foreign currencies which are frozen in tremendous quantities abroad.

Egypt is an example. I think the record will show that we have nearly \$100 million frozen in Egypt. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] said that eventually we could use it to pay our embassy expenses, and I suppose we could, but that is going to take a long, long time, to use that much money in this fashion.

In India, for example, we have in excess of \$300 million which has been accumulated and which has been frozen in the currency of that country, and ap-

parently we cannot retrieve that. To me that is just the same as lost.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee particularly on their effort to try to use some device to unfreeze these funds. I agree with their program wholeheartedly and I hope that they will be able finally to bring it to a successful conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, I want to set the record straight so far as the Committee on Agriculture is concerned. We feel that to a large extent the purpose that we had in mind originally in enacting this law has been, as I stated earlier, perverted.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. SIKES addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill represents hundreds of hours of work both in the preparation of the budget requests and in the screening of the requests by the subcommittee. These hearings are not glamorous and in fact get to be a sort of grind; but these long days of hearings are absolutely necessary in the attempt to find ways to reduce spending without eliminating necessary or valuable services. The report which is available to all Members is so well detailed that further comments on each item is unnecessary.

The resulting bill is not a perfect bill and I am sure improvements can always be made to these bills but this unanimously recommended bill is, generally speaking, a good bill. I am glad that as a member of the subcommittee which developed this bill, I can urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the appropriation contained in this bill for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West.

The East-West Center, as it is generally called, was created to achieve a national interest under the Mutual Security Act of 1960. Its primary objective is the promotion of better relations through mutual understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific.

In May of 1961, President Johnson, then Vice President, dedicated the site of the Center on the University of Hawaii campus with these words:

The purpose * * * is to bring together proud and honorable cultures whose strengths are drawn from antiquity and to fuse a new strength for freedom that will last through eternity.

Hawaii was chosen as the site for the Center because there peoples of many backgrounds, many of whom are of Asian and Pacific races, live in harmony despite their cultural differences.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9907

Among our national leaders who had the foresight to recognize the need for such an institution in Hawaii and who may in every sense be termed "fathers of the East-West Center" are our President, Lyndon B. Johnson; Governor—formerly delegate—John A. Burns, and the able chairman of the subcommittee which reported this bill, Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY.

In making appropriations for any project the question should be whether or not the intended objectives are being achieved. The question here then is "Is the goal of promoting better relations through mutual understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific, as enunciated by its founders being achieved?" There is impressive evidence that it is. The East-West Center has even been called a modern miracle in education by educators and writers who have reviewed it. In an article entitled "E-W Center: Educational Miracle," published in the March 21, 1964, issue of the Saturday Review of Literature, Norman Cousins, the president and editor of that publication, observed that:

The Center is both a headquarters for cultural interchange and a generating agency for new ideas and approaches in a world fumbling for ways to accommodate its diversity and pluralism.

The East-West Center at Honolulu is not quite a world university but it is the closest thing to it that exists. It deserves to be encouraged, supported and enlarged.

Although the Center has been in actual operation only a little over 3 years, it has made a tremendous impact.

As of the beginning of 1964, 129 men and women representing 28 countries have studied public administration, a most vital area of developing nations—37 Americans have studied administration in the light of the problems of Asian and Pacific countries so that they can be more effective later in work overseas.

The study of agriculture—soil science, horticulture, and agricultural economics—has been undertaken by 112 persons from 20 countries. In addition, writings on plant and food quarantine and coffee inspection had been translated into Japanese, Visayan and Ilocano.

One hundred and eighty-nine students have participated in the 1-year teacher interchange program and in the teaching of English as a second language. Thirty-two of the technical program participants took part in training courses in education subjects. These people will return to their respective nations as school administrators, curriculum directors, principals, and university instructors. Their influence will be felt throughout their countries. The new methods, materials, and insights gained at the Center will be spread to many distant lands.

In the scientific fields, 20 grantees majored in civil, electrical or general engineering, including grantees from China, 6; India, 4; and Japan, 3. The range was extensive in other fields, such as in chemistry, 14 students; 2 specialists; botany, 12 students; biochemistry, 2 specialists; genetic, 3 specialists; microbiology, 10 students; physics, 2 specialists; zoology, 13 students; and in

meteorology and in seismology, 1 specialist each. A conference on tsunamis was attended by 39 delegates from 7 countries, and a bibliography and other tsunami data were translated into English from Japanese. Another major conference, one on Asian-Pacific Science Information Centers, was cosponsored in Hong Kong with 26 delegates from 13 countries.

Other areas of study included philosophy, history, drama, music, the social sciences, and public health.

If the future program of the Center is soundly planned by its administrators and officials and adequately supported by Congress, within the next 10 years the effective leadership—political, scientific, and technical—of Asia and the Pacific areas will have received its training there.

Mr. Chairman, the East-West Center in Hawaii is fast proving to be one of the greatest investments in peace that the United States has ever made. Certainly a project which has proven itself as worthy and effective as the East-West Center deserves the support of Congress, even to the extent of expanding its program.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] for the outstanding job which he and his committee always accomplish with the State, Justice, Commerce bill.

I trust that sufficient funds may be included to enable the weather station at Parkersburg, W. Va., to operate on an 8-hour day basis. This station is responsible for weather predictions and information over a wide area of West Virginia and Ohio. Being on the Ohio River, the weather station can also be helpful in connection with flood warnings and predictions. For the farmers, businessmen, river traders, and many people in a great, expanding area, it is not unreasonable to hope that morning weather service at Parkersburg may be extended to an 8-hour day basis.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to note the consideration given by the appropriations committee and by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] subcommittee to the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West. The appropriation of \$5,300,000 for the Center for fiscal year 1965 is an act of confidence of the committee and by the House in the worth of the Center as an institution designed to promote mutual understanding between the peoples of the Pacific region. While the appropriation represents an amount substantially less than the sum requested in the budget, and while I believe it should be increased closer to the original request, a readjustment of the Center's planned level of operations will allow it to continue its valuable work.

I am particularly pleased to note that the committee has indicated its confidence in the Center even though the institution has not been without its problems; and these problems have been real. Unclear administrative relationships and lack of communication have been substantial stumbling blocks to a clear understanding of the Center. Its respon-

sibilities have been blurred and its administrations unstable and uncertain. These problems are not necessarily the fault of any particular individual or group, but stem from the growing pains of a youthful organization. In spite of these handicaps, the Center has continued to move ahead and demonstrate its potential contributions in the promotion of mutual understanding and international cooperation.

Fortunately, the recognition of these problems by the committee and by the Department of State has given to the Center the opportunity it needs for remedial action and subsequent growth. First of all, the State Department, with the attention of Assistant Secretary Battle, has given the Center the interest, guidance, and support it has previously lacked from the Federal Government. The sincerity of this interest in the Center has been demonstrated with the appointment of a full-time special assistant for East-West Center Affairs. In the second place, the congressional committees that deal with the Center have had the opportunity, denied them at the inception, to examine the Center with some care. In the third place, the release of the recently completed study of the Center by the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs should provide the guidelines for a hopefully harmonious administrative relationship between the Center, the University of Hawaii, the State, and Federal Governments.

The time has arrived for the quiet and uninterrupted development and growth of the Center. The confidence in the ability of the Center to achieve this development and growth is reflected in the recommendation by the committee and approval by the House of the funds needed to continue the Center's programs at a level higher than that approved for fiscal year 1964. I hope that all of those who are concerned with the success of the Center will now give it the time to develop. There is no sense in continually pulling up a plant just to see whether it is growing.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 17:

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 1131), \$993,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is altogether too much for entertainment and liquor allowances in this bill. For the State Department alone, as I see the line items set forth, there is more than \$1 million. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to offer an amendment. I have of-

ferred them in the past. And it has been an exercise in futility to try to cut this spending for liquor. I am not going to offer an amendment to reduce the \$993,000 for this purpose as found on page 3 of the bill and the \$75,000 for the same purpose for "International conferences and contingencies" to be found on page 6 of the bill. There are numerous other entertainment allowances in the bill.

I say again, as I have found in the past, it is merely an exercise in futility to offer amendments to strike out or reduce these liquor funds. I protest it and want the RECORD to show my protest of the huge amounts to be spent for this purpose as found in this bill.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11134 calls for over a million dollars for "representation." Representation is just a fancy name for entertainment.

With all the poverty we have in this country, I cannot justify voting for this lavish liquor spending by the State Department. If they consume a little less alcohol at the State Department, perhaps we would not be having so many problems around the world.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. MATTHEWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of this committee and the other members of the committee for the excellent work they have done on this bill.

I take this time to call the attention of the Committee to a statement that was made on January 28 this year by Mr. Burke Marshall, Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, who appeared before the committee to justify his budget and made a statement that I put in the RECORD on April 29.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this statement allegedly inferred that there were two counties in my congressional district in Florida where Negroes may have been denied their voting rights because of discrimination by voting registrars or through intimidation by private individuals or public officials. The two counties that he mentioned were Flagler County and Union County.

The citizens of these two counties naturally are concerned about this misstatement of fact. That is one reason, Mr. Chairman, why I do not have too much confidence in the Civil Rights Commission. I believe this Commission is guilty of making a conclusion before it makes an investigation.

Mr. Chairman, it just so happens that the secretary of state of Florida can make available to Mr. Marshall or to the Civil Rights Commission the voting facts about the State of Florida. They do not need any money to get these facts. In Florida our citizens do not have to pay a poll tax in order to vote. There are no literacy tests in Florida.

This last year we had hundreds of thousands, of course, of our citizens to qualify to vote and included in that number were 240,000 colored citizens qualified to vote in Florida.

In these two counties I just mentioned, in Flagler County, let us take that one county as an example, there were 293 Democrats, colored Democrats, who were registered and only 1 colored Republican.

Now, it just may be that Mr. Marshall and the Civil Rights Commission were getting a little mixed up with the fact that there was just one Republican who was qualified. But, that is not unusual in southern counties in our areas not to have too many Republicans qualify.

Mr. Chairman, Flagler County is a small county insofar as the number of people is concerned. It is one of the great counties of Florida, with a beautiful coastline and it is a county of industrious, good people. We have wonderful Irish potatoes grown there. The murmuring pine trees invite a visitor and give industry to the community.

In this small county, 1,820 white Democrats were registered as of April 4, 1964, and 293 colored Democrats.

Please keep in mind that it is a small county.

In the other county, Union County, permit me to point out, there was also only one colored Republican in that county who was registered. But in this small county only 2,251 white Democrats were registered and there were 127 colored Democrats who were registered.

So, Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say to this great committee that next year I believe I can save it a little money if it wants to check on whether or not any voters are being discriminated against in my Eighth Congressional District in Florida. For just a 5-cent postage stamp we can get that information.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. My distinguished colleague from Florida is making a very valuable contribution. However, there is one point in which he leaves the issue a little cloudy insofar as I am concerned. He brought up the question of Republicans qualifying. I am not sure whether he is talking about the scarcity of Republicans qualifying or qualified Republicans in Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman's point is very well taken.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I trust the gentleman has read the hearings with respect to requests for funds for the Civil Rights Commission wherein he will find they have 55 attorneys over there. They spent more than \$100,000 on travel in the last fiscal year, as I recall it. I think he will be surprised if he has not read the hearings to note how few cases they have brought to a conclusion out of the total number.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; protection of the person of the Pres-

ident of the United States; acquisition, collection, classification and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with, and for the official use of, the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions, such exchange to be subject to cancellation if dissemination is made outside the receiving departments or related agencies; and such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General, including purchase for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year (not to exceed five hundred and one, including one armored vehicle, for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; firearms and ammunition; not to exceed \$10,000 for taxicab hire to be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in this paragraph; payment of rewards; and not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, and to be accounted for solely on his certificate; \$150,445,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be \$22,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in reading the hearings on the questioning of Mr. Hoover about the Communist influence in civil rights agitation organizations, I notice the reply of Mr. Hoover was given off the record.

All of us know that there is, as has been verified by Mr. Hoover, a very serious Communist infiltration in these organizations, such as CORE, the National Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, and numerous other similar outfits. We know that W. E. B. duBois, a longtime leader of the NAACP, was an old Communist. We know that Phillip Randolph belongs to numerous Communist-front organizations. We know that Bayard Rustin, who led the notorious march on Washington, has been a known Communist, and a convicted sex pervert.

Martin Luther King attended the Highlander Folk School in Monteagle, Tenn., a notorious Communist establishment.

Mr. Chairman, nearly every time a so-called civil rights demonstration occurs, there are Communists or Communist sympathizers leading the parade.

Just the other day, on March 30, a white man was arrested in Jackson, Miss., in a Negro section of town, for being drunk and disorderly and for resisting arrest. This man's name was Richard A. Jewett. He said he was a graduate of one of the large engineering colleges in the East. He volunteered to the Jackson City police that he was a Communist, a member of the Communist Party.

When this CORE organization, with whom he was employed on salary, made their usual spurious complaint to the Justice Department that Jewett had been a victim of police brutality, the FBI came down and Jewett admitted to the FBI, also, that he was a Communist. Yet this man is on the payroll of CORE, and he is

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9909

going throughout the South stirring up trouble between the white and the colored people.

I just wanted to ask the chairman of the committee if, in this off-the-record conversation, Mr. Hoover gave any details regarding Communist activities in this movement.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should say to the gentleman that I must respect the distinguished Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and follow the record in this regard. He went into the subject of Communist activities with the members of the committee in minute detail. But beyond that I cannot answer the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that if the Justice Department spent half the time and money trying to ferret out the Communists that are at work trying to destroy this country as they do in harassing the people of the Southern States, there would be much less trouble in this country.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Perhaps if my friend from Mississippi had heard the testimony of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, I am sure he would agree with the members of the subcommittee and myself when I say he has been a splendid Director and is doing a fine job. The gentleman from Mississippi need have no fear so far as the internal security of this country is concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I quite agree with the gentleman that Mr. Hoover has done a magnificent job. I have nothing but praise for Mr. Hoover. I would remind you, however, that Mr. Hoover is in an agency of the Justice Department, and thus must act in accordance with policies laid down by the Attorney General. It could be that the Attorney General wants this information withheld from the public.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

For necessary expenses for construction of the Inter-American Highway, in accordance with the provisions of section 212 of title 23 of the United States Code, to remain available until expended, \$4,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask someone if this is the item, the Inter-American Highway, on which the U.S. contribution was supposed to have ended several years ago? Are they back here again asking for \$4 million for this highway?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I must say the gentleman is correct. We felt this road would have been completed long before now. But there has been an additional authorization and as construction proceeds they have run into some difficulties in the construction of the highway.

Mr. GROSS. Can this be said to be the last payment out of the American taxpayer's pockets for this road or is it going to go on interminably?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I cannot say that this will be the last payment, I must say to my distinguished friend from Iowa. There are additional moneys authorized.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I must confess on previous bills, I have made the statement on this floor that this was the last amount. I have had witnesses tell me "This is the last amount that will be appropriated for this purpose." But this seems to be endless. I asked again—Is this to be the end? And I have received some assurance that it was. I will say to the gentleman, this is like so many other things that we find here in Washington where we think that some day we will come to the end of it, but I do not think anybody on this floor can give you the assurance today as to when we will see the end of this program.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Now the gentleman from Iowa will, I am sure, understand after hearing what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has just said, why I could not answer categorically that this would be the last payment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I think it should be pointed out, however, that since this road construction started and since the original authorization was made and the original statements were made that there have been added to this system some additional specifications and additional mileage and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I still hope this is the last drag out of our pockets. But I am beginning to believe this will go on in perpetuity.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We can give the distinguished gentleman from Iowa no assurance whatever in this regard, because additional contract authority is outstanding. When that is exercised, the committee will have nothing to do but to pay the amount of money contracted for.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon him by the Act approved May 7, 1934 (40 U.S.C. 13a-13b), including improvements, maintenance, repairs, equipment, supplies, materials, and appurtenances; special clothing for workmen; and personal and other services (including temporary labor without reference to the Classification and Retirement Acts, as amended), and for snow removal by hire of men and equipment or under contract without compliance with section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5); \$304,600.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman if by any chance there are any funds in the bill for the purchase of the parking lot the Supreme Court wants to acquire east of the Supreme Court Building itself?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The answer is definitely no.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, because I know that is not authorized.

While I have the floor, and in order to avoid obtaining recognition again almost immediately, I note the fact that the next item in the bill is for an \$8,100 automobile for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Is the price of automobiles going up? What is happening in the field of Cadillacs and Lincoln Continentals?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should explain to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that the Chief Justice's car was formerly one of those Cadillac \$500-a-year rental cars. As an examination of the printed testimony will disclose, we were utterly surprised to learn that General Motors has upped the annual rental fee from \$500 to \$1,000 on the Chief Justice's car.

Included in the \$8,100, in addition to this \$1,000, are the wages for the chauffeur, the money for gas and oil, the money for repairs, and so forth. In other words, it is for the complete cost of the operation of the limousine for the Chief Justice.

Mr. GROSS. I say to the gentleman that I have always been mystified by this business of General Motors or any other automobile company leasing automobiles to certain Members of Congress and others in the executive branch for \$500 a year. Can the gentleman from New York lease a Cadillac for \$500 a year? How is that done?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I cannot. I do not know exactly how it is done, but I never heard of it being done until Eisenhower became President. This is one of the few things I give President Eisenhower credit for, because it saved the taxpayers a lot of money, as a result of being able to get a car for the \$500-a-year rental fee.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot help but wonder what the consideration is, as between the \$500 a year for the use of a Cadillac and the \$6,000 or more price tag to others. What happened? Who is making up the difference between the going price of say \$7,000 for a Cadillac and the \$500 a year?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I believe it is commonly known that General Motors and the other car manufacturers let certain high Government officials have these automobiles at such rentals as an advertising gesture.

Mr. GROSS. They are getting to be so common around here in official circles that I believe they have lost some of their advertising value.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that it has not gotten to the point where either of us would be able to get one for \$500 a year. I had to buy my automobile.

Mr. GROSS. Since the gentleman injected a little politics into this discussion—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, I never inject politics.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman referred to this procedure as taking place under the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If I were to inject politics, I should say that the gentleman whose automobile we are discussing is a distinguished member of the gentleman's party. He is the Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate your remarks concerning the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, but let me proceed. This intrigues me because Eisenhower had a Secretary of Defense who said, as the gentleman will remember, that what was good for General Motors was good for the country. The Democrats raised all kinds of hell over that when the statement was made. Yet I see this galaxy of Cadillacs on both sides of the Capitol and some are operated by the most outspoken critics of that statement. Now, apparently, what is good for General Motors is also good for some Members of Congress, including Democrats. Is that not about right?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Is the gentleman referring to the Ford automobile known as a Galaxie?

Mr. GROSS. No. I am referring to all of these Cadillacs we see around here and the fact that the Democrats claimed they did not like them when Wilson made his remark.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I well remember back before we had Dwight D. Eisenhower as President and when the late distinguished Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, was deposed as Speaker and became majority leader in the 80th Congress. It became incumbent upon all of us Democratic Members of the House—and I am proud to say with the assistance of certain Republican Members who also chipped in \$100 apiece—to buy him a Cadillac automobile such as he had when Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. The point I want to make, if the gentleman will let me is that I just cannot understand how those Democrats who were so critical of "Engine Charley" Wilson's statement can now stoop to ride around in a General Motors product and one costing \$8,000. I do not get this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Arms control and disarmament activities

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for arms control and disarmament activities authorized by the Act of September 26, 1961, as amended (75 Stat. 631; 77 Stat. 341), \$11,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 53, line 20, strike out the figure "\$11,000,000" and insert "\$7,500,000".

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that every Member of the House wants peace and wants arms control. But I say to you that to boost this super-duper agency to \$11 million a year is beyond reason. What peace we have in this world is going to be maintained not by disarming, but by maintaining the forces we have in being and their ability to deliver nuclear warheads anywhere in the world. This is what preserves the peace of the world and not the existence of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would cut \$3½ million from this appropriation. It would reduce it to the expenditure of the past year. I think it ought to be cut much further to \$1 million or \$2 million. I am perfectly willing to maintain an organization with sufficient personnel versed in arms control and disarmament matters to carry on conversations and conferences, but I know of no reason why we should expend this kind of money on this kind of an agency. Under the law the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency even has the authority to construct laboratories to carry on research even though billions are already being spent by the Government for this purpose. If you will read the hearings you will also find that the payroll of this organization is one of the fattest in Government in terms of high salaries.

You will also note, if you read the hearings, that it employs consultants and contract firms all over the map in addition to the direct hire personnel. Let me add that I am not convinced that the present head of the Disarmament Agency, Mr. William C. Foster, is one on whom I would want to rely in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read to the House a statement that Mr. Foster made on June 13, 1950. He was then Deputy Director of the Economic Cooperation Administration and testified on behalf of the foreign aid appropriations bill before the Senate Appropriations Committee. Listen to what he said on June 13, 1950:

I am happy to tell the Appropriations Committee that, in my judgment the trend of events in South Korea is more favorable than it has been at any time since the liberation of that country in 1945. The reasons for optimism are military, political and economic. It is my considered opinion that in the face of great difficulty the Government of the Republic of Korea is now steadily gaining strength in each of these three sections.

He goes on to say that:

A rigorous training program has built up a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers; one that is prepared to meet any challenge

by North Korean forces; and one that has cleaned out the guerilla bands in South Korea in one area after another.

Two weeks later American blood was being spilled all over the rice paddies and mountains in South Korea. This is the man who is today the head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Government official who knew no more about what was about to take place in Korea than the man in the moon.

Mr. Chairman, I am not willing to turn over the disarmament of this country and the creation of an international army to this man in the light of the statement he so freely made before a committee of Congress. Mr. Chairman, there is no reason in the world why we cannot save \$3½ million here and now. The cut ought to be deeper than that, but this is a first step and a reasonable compromise.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I think the issue here is very simple. In this very Congress last year this House and the Congress authorized \$20 million to be expended over a period of 2 years for an arms control and disarmament program. The amount of \$7.5 million was approved last year for such purpose. The \$11 million in the bill is still \$1.5 million short of the total authorization approved here in the House of Representatives for the activities of this agency.

The issue in effect is, if we are spending \$47 billion on a defense program what is wrong with spending \$11 million to investigate what avenues there might be to peace and arms control?

The gentleman in charge of this agency is one of the most respected in Government; a good Republican, if you please, the Honorable William C. Foster. He is a former Under Secretary of Commerce, a former Under Secretary of Defense, a fine, distinguished gentleman, who I am sure will carry on this agency with sagacity and with safety.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa be voted down.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman briefly for a question.

Mr. STINSON. Can the gentleman from New York name a situation in which a major power disarmed and did not find itself in an armed conflict?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am not an expert on this subject, I will say to the distinguished gentleman. I do know that this agency had something to do with the nuclear test ban treaty. I believe that was a step toward peace. Perhaps the gentleman does not agree with me in this regard, but I am one who believes that.

Mr. STINSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. STINSON. I would like to remind the gentleman that any time a major nation disarms it finds itself in a weakened position and then invites at-

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9911

tack from an aggressor. If we remain stronger than the Communists we do not have to fear attack.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman should understand that this Agency studies the matter of arms control and disarmament by way of research contracts. The final decision is up not only to the Pentagon and the Defense Department, but is up to the President of the United States and everyone else concerned. This Agency is not the Agency that is going to disarm us. It may merely make recommendations. We do not propose to disarm until and unless it is the right and safe thing to do.

Mr. STINSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. STINSON. Which agency then is going to disarm our country and invite attack by some foreign aggressor?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I believe the Congress of the United States will have a great deal to say about that. The gentleman voted, I assume, for the appropriation of \$47 billion in support of the defense budget not too many weeks ago, did he not?

Mr. STINSON. But that was not for disarmament.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is \$11 million to investigate the situation in case the situation were such that we were to proceed toward arms control and disarmament and how this would affect the economy and employment here in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, a member of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am sure the chairman will agree too that this Agency also studies the harm that can come from disarmament proposals as well as the benefits?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Exactly, exactly. The Agency is not headed toward disarmament. This is an agency which by way of research contracts studies the consequences of disarmament.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield further to the gentleman, but the gentleman is monopolizing a good bit of the time here, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. STINSON. Can the gentleman from New York tell me of a study that this organization has made where it recommended against disarmament? If so, none of these have been called to my attention.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not believe they have made any such recommendations as yet.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would like to get my own time on this amendment and I hope the gentleman from New York will not move for a vote on it before I can speak to it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. STINSON. I object.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to reduce the Disarmament Agency funds. I believe disarmament should be a bipartisan policy. Disarmament and arms control rank equally with U.S. foreign policy and U.S. defense. These are major national security programs which should be handled across party lines and by cooperation and agreement.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that when the United States spends \$47 billion for defense, we should at least spend \$11 million for planning for arms reduction by agreement with inspection, to see that we live in a safer world.

Mr. Chairman, as I am sure the members of the committee know, I am one of the representatives of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa. Our city is probably one of the prime targets in the country. We do not like to live under the fear that we have various missiles and other types of nuclear weapons trained at us. I am sure that citizens of countries all over the world share our feelings in Pittsburgh. We must work for mutual agreements for arms control with adequate inspection.

I believe it would be a fine world if we could come to the universal point of view where we could in all the cities of the world know that we by inspection are safe in our homes, in our jobs, and with our families. Killing instead of agreements for universal security, is unthinkable. Lying in wait to destroy another man and his family is a ghastly policy. Bigger armaments cause bigger fears, which combine to make bigger dangers for all peoples.

My second point is this: I served for 14 years on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, and was on that committee during the year 1950. I was one of those who Friday before the Sunday of the North Korean attack, with several other members of the committee attended a special briefing session that was deeply serious and unofficial, held in the House Foreign Affairs Committee Room. We asked for and heard General LeMay, of the Air Force, also the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, an admiral assigned from the Navy, among others. Unbelievably, my special point

was I was worried about Korea. There were many other serious trouble spots discussed around the world. We were reassured by various people that we would be able to hold South Korea. Previously I had objected to reducing our U.S. troops and support, so I was deeply concerned. From North Korea there had been feints and attacks. We did not know whether they were preludes to big, or just little, isolated attacks that came from the north at the time. But many of us including myself, gave South Korea strong support.

There was no one in this country, there was nobody on this House floor or the floor of the other body who knew that an attack very definitely was coming. So to lay responsibility at the feet of one man, Mr. William Foster, who has been a fine public servant, is a little less than giving full responsibility where it should lie. There is no doubt South Korea had, and now has, a fine patriotic army, and we should be proud of their standing with us, for which I am deeply grateful. There is no doubt that William Foster was right in his statement just before the North Korean attack that South Korea was strong, and getting stronger—that is one of the reasons for the quick, hard, and swift attack, in my opinion.

I do rise in defense of William Foster, Administrator of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency because I have known him as a long time Republican and staunch patriot with devoted public service. I have known his family, I have known him in business, and I have known him as an attorney. I have known William Foster in my service on the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the various capacities in which he has served our U.S. Government. I have followed closely the work of the Disarmament Agency, both in this country and at the sessions in Geneva. My considered opinion favors continuance of the good bipartisan work on arms control and disarmament.

In my estimation, this country would be wrong, if it simply emphasizes armament, more armament. We are piling up armament and nuclear weapons so that we not only scare everybody abroad, but we also scare ourselves. How much overkill do we need in this country? Ten, 15, 20 times, and we do not feel secure. Therefore I think we need a better balance in work for disarmament and arms control with adequate inspection. Therefore I recommend defeat of the amendment. The course of arms races, bigger and bigger armaments, bigger and bigger taxes, bigger and bigger burdens on every family in the United States and throughout the world, is sheer folly. A good defense does not need to continue to the point of such folly. Many of these same people on this House floor who advocate bigger and bigger useless armaments and oppose arms control, are the same people who beat their breasts and loudly call for U.S. budget reduction and isolation policies.

Let us be sensible citizens of a peaceful world. Let us work for arms reduction, disarmament, and support this good work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I always wonder when some colleague of mine votes for \$47 billion for war and then quarrels with himself when the vote is on \$11 million to search for the path to peace. Why should the lure to bring on the destruction of all mankind be of such irresistible force as to close the mind of any human being to even a fleeting hope?

Dr. Foster appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, and he made a most favorable impression. Other witnesses of the highest standing and international prestige said there never would have been an arms ban treaty if it had not been for Dr. Foster and the Agency he so ably directs. I must accept their evaluation, and on this testimony and that information it would appear clear and plain that Dr. Foster and his Agency have made one of the largest contributions to the United States in the security of the present and the future in the history of our great Republic.

I did not know that Dr. Foster was a Republican. The matter of his politics never entered my mind. But I saw in Dr. Foster a great and dedicated public servant, the goal of whose efforts is the peace for which I and most American men and women pray, and, as a Democrat, now that I know his politics, I give credit to the Republican Party for producing such an outstanding American.

Politics, Mr. Chairman, always should end at the waterline. Republican hearts and Democratic hearts alike are attuned to the love of peace on earth, good will among men and nations. Even while we vote billions to keep our Nation strong and to assure our security under any and all circumstances, we shall continue courageously in the quest for peace and the hope that someday there will be no more wars nor rumors of wars.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be crushingly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, we are being told anyone who is for this amendment is against peace. Actually, if you want to cut this appropriation down to the \$7.5 million that the Agency has spent this year, you are supposed to be a warmonger, I guess, even if you are only against giving it \$3½ million more to be wasted because the Disarmament Agency is doing a very poor job and just giving it more money will not improve things. The charter of this Agency should be amended before it gets another cent of money. We should not waste time or money on its activities until this is done because they can, in fact, bungle around and make war more likely, not less likely. This Congress should pass amendments which will bar the Agency from building up a giant in-house, in-bred research organization; it should be barred from permitting its director to engage in interna-

tional negotiations; it should be barred from propagandizing the citizens of the United States with their own tax money; it should be taken out from under the wings of the State Department; it should be made to report its activities to Congress and its proposals to reduce the armaments of this country; and it should stop the frightful escalation of its own expenditures. There is legislation now pigeonhole by the Foreign Affairs Committee that would do all this.

Why do I say this Agency is doing a bad job? Because in the Moscow treaty last year it took a part in surrendering the one weapon in our peace arsenal which is, or was, the most powerful and had the best chance to give the world some peace. That was our dogged instance at the conference tables and before the so-called court of world opinion that the U.S.S.R. should lower the Iron Curtain and permit the inspection of its territory necessary to make sure it is not cheating in secret against other countries. Until that is permitted, no treaty is worth the paper it is written on. Now, with the Disarmament Agency's participation, that principle is gone with the wind. We gave it up in order to get the Russians to consent to the treaty of Moscow. We gave up the chance to achieve binding agreements. They gave up nothing and all this was done with the advice and consent of the Disarmament Agency. That is why I say it is doing a poor job. That is why I say it is bungling, and that it is more likely taking us away from peace in the world than toward it, and leading us into much trouble in the future.

The second thing evidencing its bungling is this dramatic exhibition of so-called unilateral interlocking arms control which was put on a couple or three Mondays ago. At 1 o'clock on a Monday afternoon Khrushchev makes a statement saying he is going to cut fissionable materials production, then at 2 o'clock Johnson makes a statement saying he is going to do so, too—unilateral statements, interlocking in time and subject matter—tacit agreements, secretly negotiated, and publicly announced. These are agreements not subject to the Senate's advice and consent, yet they are solemnly binding on the United States by our President's word. What is Khrushchev's word worth? Do you trust him enough to trust him with your life? Your children's lives?

How good a deal did Johnson make with Khrushchev? It turns out he is cutting U.S. plutonium production 20 percent and by the man's own words Khrushchev is cutting U.S.S.R. production 0 percent. It turns out we are going to cut our uranium production 40 percent in return for whatever ambiguous amount Khrushchev calls a "substantial" cut in his own production. It also turns out the whole deal is not to be policed by anybody. We are to trust Mr. Khrushchev to keep the deal; we are to trust his unknown successor to do likewise.

That is the kind of deals the U.S. Disarmament Agency is letting us get into. Yet, anyone who wants to give them less money to do it is charged with being a

warmonger. How topsy-turvy can this debate get? If you want to put up \$3.5 million more than you did last year, I say you are not voting for peace, you are voting to throw your money and the U.S. taxpayers' money away on something that could be very dangerous. The Gross amendment should be adopted and no bill to amend the Disarmament Agency Charter, H.R. 10311, should be passed before we pull any more boobies. The Agency is supposed to keep us from losing our shirts to the Russians, not help us to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment to cut the disarmament appropriation from \$11 million back to what it was last year.

I am not going to try in the few minutes I have here to answer the charges that my friend and colleague from California [Mr. HOSMER] has made. I just want to say that I disagree thoroughly with him.

I want to go back to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] said. If we can spend \$47 to \$50 billion annually in preparation for war, certainly we can spend \$10 or \$11 million annually to explore the possibilities, the approaches, and the methods and the dangers that may be involved in any type of disarmament or any type of a lessening of tension between the two great nuclear powers of the world.

I have sat on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for 18 years, and I have had as much to do with the building up of the nuclear strength of the United States as any man in this House. I voted for every dollar of defense appropriations, and I voted for every dollar that we have authorized in the Committee on Atomic Energy. So nobody can say to me that I am muddleheaded on the problem of nuclear power in war, because I have supported the strength of the United States and intend to continue to support it. But I am also going to support any kind of effort we can make to pursue some logical method of lessening the likelihood of nuclear war. I say that these cuts—I could go into this at some length—in the production of plutonium and uranium 235 were not made as a quid pro quo with the Russians for doing likewise. We did this on the basis of our own judgment that we had adequate nuclear strength in the world and that there was no use in going ahead and continuing to multiply that strength ad infinitum.

The administration was proceeding on the principle that there was a limit to the kind of destruction that you want to turn loose in this world. We do have an adequate inventory of nuclear weapons within the scope of the arrangement that has been made and within the scope of the continued production that will continue to be made, notwithstanding the cuts that have been planned, to maintain this Nation strong.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9913

In the meantime I say with all the sincerity at my command, we must study and plan for the day when we will not need to use these nuclear weapons and, if possible, we must find the path to peace. That path is obscure at this time. It is a devious and complicated maze. We must find our way by studying every possible avenue of approach.

We are fortunate to have a great and wise citizen, Mr. William Foster, as the guiding administrator of this young Agency. Notwithstanding the criticism we have heard today, Mr. Foster is worthy of confidence and support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee of the Whole, may I say that the arguments advanced by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] remind me of his "bananas on Pike's Peak." Perhaps many of my colleagues may not know what we are talking about, but the gentleman who coined the expression "bananas on Pike's Peak" was the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER]—and I say that, of course, affectionately. But, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the gentleman from California being so expertly uninformed or misinformed on this subject, that he should criticize a man of the stature of Bill Foster, a distinguished member of his own party.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. I thought I made it clear that the President's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is doing a poor job—and he was doing a poor job because—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is criticizing Bill Foster who is the head of this Agency. It was Bill Foster who came before this committee and requested the funds recommended in this bill. Among his other achievements as the result of research contracts gone into by this Agency which has not been in existence so long, we now have the so-called "hot line" agreement and the limited nuclear test ban agreement. We also now have a U.N. resolution calling upon all nations to refrain from placing weapons of mass destruction in orbit. I say if we did nothing else but achieve these three things, it is well worthwhile spending the small sum of \$11 million when compared with spending \$47 billion for defense.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purposes does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to get one or two things clear. It is said I laid at the door of William C. Foster the responsibility for the war in Korea. I did no such thing. I said he did not exercise good judgment when he went before the Appropriations Committee of the other body in 1950 asking foreign aid funds for South Korea, asserting that Government to be strong and having enough trained troops to meet any threat from North Korea. Only 2 weeks later the war was on in Korea, resulting in 35,000 Americans killed and another 100,000 wounded. I say his judgment was not good. I repeat it. Then politics was injected into the debate when it was stated that Foster is a Republican. I do not know whether he is or not. He certainly has gone to his reward with the Democrats. Maybe he wears the label—I do not know. But he is your boy now.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not yield at this minute. I did not use your name. I will yield to you if I have the time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is said this \$11 million is only a small percent of the defense budget. This is a timeworn argument. Any item of spending can be broken down into small units—any item of Federal spending that you want to choose—where compared with other spending.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. All through the debate on this particular item it has been mentioned that if we can spend \$47 billion on defense we can spend \$11 million on arms control and disarmament. The Agency's records, which are contained in the hearings both on this bill and in the Department of Defense bill, show that the requests for outside contracts only on disarmament and arms control for fiscal year 1965 are estimated at approximately \$75 million for the agencies of Government doing work in this area. I referred to this in my remarks during the general debate. This \$11 million is just for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and could easily be reduced the \$3.5 million the gentleman recommends, without any harm to the program.

Mr. GROSS. Members have made emotional speeches about buying peace through disarmament. I have voted for every dollar that was asked for the Military Establishment. Yet we do not have peace in the world today, even though we are spending \$50 billion a year in the Defense Department.

Everyone knows that we are not going to disarm in the foreseeable future, so why should we continue this fiction? Why should we continue this Agency at the rate of \$11 million a year? I say again that with an annual expenditure

of \$1 million or \$2 million this Government could maintain an organization capable of discussing arms control and disarmament with the Russians or anyone else. For many years just as much was accomplished in this field with an expenditure of \$1 million or less each year.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. What is often overlooked is that if we are to have peace we must have tools to arrive at it, not merely an agency for which we vote some funds, which we call a disarmament agency, and then go away to say, "What good boys we are."

It takes good, hard, solid work to attain peace.

One of the most important tools there is, in the work toward peace of the world, is the force which the United States did at one time have to force the lowering of the Iron Curtain and to force inspection and detection procedures behind the Iron Curtain, so that there could be some assurance to the world that preparations were not being made surreptitiously to disturb the peace of the world.

That has been given up. That has been surrendered. That has been entirely eliminated by this Disarmament Agency which we are asked to reward by allowing the \$11 million.

Mr. GROSS. Someone mentioned the test ban treaty. I ask the gentleman from California if, before this superduper agency came into being, we did not have a moratorium on testing?

Mr. HOSMER. That was the very treaty that gave up this principal part in our arsenal of peace, which we should be sorry about losing.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending pro forma amendment.

I must take advantage of this time, since my distinguished friend from Iowa refused to yield to me for a question. I did want to point out to him that Bill Foster was not our boy. Bill Foster was Under Secretary of Defense in what administration? In the Eisenhower Republican administration. He was no more our boy than is Christian Herter, who I trust is presently doing a fine job at Geneva on our tariff negotiations.

What about Henry Cabot Lodge, in Vietnam?

Are these our boys? No. They are distinguished Americans who are doing a job for the American people. I wish we had more of the Henry Cabot Lodges, Christian Herter, and Bill Fosters.

Who was Bill Foster? Was he a Republican, asked the gentleman from Iowa? Bill Foster had to be a Republican, did he not, to be the president of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp.? That does not sound like a Democratic concern to me.

I do not know whose campaign they contribute to. I would be surprised if it were in the Democratic area.

The point is—and you cannot get away from it, I say to my distinguished friend

not too far from Pike's Peak—the issue is whether we are going to spend \$47 billion for defense and not spend \$11 million to study how we can control arms. Is it not worthwhile to study and research the subject of controlling arms all over the world at a cost of \$11 million?

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote rejecting the pending amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 28, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to administer any program which is funded in whole or in part from foreign currencies or credits for which a specific dollar appropriation therefor has not been made.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Gross. On page 61, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program (including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a National Service Corps or similar domestic Peace Corps type of program."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that has been included in every appropriation bill, with the possible exception of the legislative appropriation bill, thus far in this session. I believe it was in all appropriation bills last year, including this one. I would like to invite the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], to accept the amendment this year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman accept the amendment?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am going to rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, then I shall continue to point out that I now have an inquiry underway dealing with an organization which is apparently using some \$84,000 of the taxpayers' funds allegedly in contravention of the amendment adopted to the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill of last year, and it is exactly the same amendment as I have offered here. I hope to find out whether there has been a violation of this provision in the Health, Education, and Welfare bill as enacted last year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

You might recall that I was foolish enough last year to not too vigorously oppose this amendment, which was then offered by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]. Since then I have found out that this is a costly amendment to the taxpayers. There is not 15 cents in this bill in connection with the establishment of a National Service Corps or similar domestic Peace Corps type of program, none whatever. The gentleman from Iowa knows that as well as does the gentleman from New York. But the point is that the amendment was offered last year and was printed in every copy of every bill last year. I am told that this runs into thousands of dollars. So for that reason, and in the interest of economy, it is time to discontinue this useless amendment of the gentleman from Iowa. He has not saved the taxpayer 15 cents with it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the pending amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 42, noes 50.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gross and Mr. ROONEY of New York.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 55, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FASCELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11134) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MICHEL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHEL moves to recommit the bill H.R. 11134 to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 312, noes 40, answered "present" 1, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—312

Adair	Cunningham	Hollifield
Addabbo	Curtin	Holland
Albert	Curtis	Horan
Anderson	Daddario	Hosmer
Andrews,	Dague	Hull
N. Dak.	Daniels	Hutchinson
Arends	Davis, Ga.	Ichord
Aspinall	Dawson	Jarman
Auchincloss	Delaney	Jennings
Ayres	Dent	Joelson
Baker	Denton	Johnson, Calif.
Baldwin	Derounian	Johnson, Wis.
Barrett	Diggs	Jones
Barry	Dingell	Jones, Mo.
Bates	Dole	Karsten
Battin	Donohue	Karth
Becker	Downing	Kastenmeier
Beckworth	Dulski	Keith
Belcher	Duncan	Kelly
Bell	Dwyer	Keogh
Berry	Edwards	Kilgore
Betts	Ellsworth	Kluczyński
Blatnik	Evins	Knox
Boggs	Fallon	Kornegay
Boland	Fascell	Kunkel
Bolton,	Findley	Laird
Frances P.	Fisher	Langen
Bolton,	Flood	Leggett
Oliver P.	Fogarty	Lesinski
Bow	Ford	Lindsey
Brademas	Fountain	Lipcomb
Bray	Fraser	Long, La.
Brock	Frelinghuysen	Long, Md.
Bromwell	Friedel	McClary
Brooks	Fulton, Pa.	McCulloch
Broomfield	Fulton, Tenn.	McDade
Brotzman	Gary	McDowell
Brown, Calif.	Gialmo	McFall
Brown, Ohio	Gibbons	McIntire
Broyhill, N.C.	Gilbert	McLoskey
Broyhill, Va.	Glenn	Macdonald
Burke	Gonzalez	MacGregor
Burkhalter	Goodling	Madden
Burton, Calif.	Grabowski	Mahon
Burton, Utah	Gray	Marsh
Byrne, Pa.	Green, Oreg.	Martin, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffin	Martin, Nebr.
Cahill	Griffiths	Mathias
Cameron	Grover	Matsunaga
Cannon	Gubser	Milliken
Carey	Gurney	Minish
Casey	Hagen, Calif.	Minshall
Cederberg	Halleck	Monagan
Celler	Halpern	Moorhead
Chamberlain	Hansen	Morgan
Chelf	Harding	Morrison
Chenoweth	Hardy	Morse
Clark	Harris	Mosher
Clausen,	Harrison	Moss
Don H.	Harsha	Multer
Clawson, Del.	Harvey, Ind.	Murphy, Ill.
Cleveland	Hays	Murphy, N.Y.
Cohelan	Hecley	Murray
Conte	Hébert	Natcher
Cooley	Hechler	Nedzi
Corbett	Henderson	Nelsen
Corman	Hoeven	Nix

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9915

O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quile
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.

Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Senner
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens

Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Van Deertin
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wilson,
Wright
Wylder
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—40

Abbt
Abernethy
Alger
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Bruce
Clancy
Collier
Derwinski
Devine
Everett
Flynt
Foreman
Fuqua

Gathings
Goodell
Gross
Haley
Hall
Johansen
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kyl
Latta
Lennon
McMillan
Matthews
Moore

Rivers, S.C.
Saylor
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stinson
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wharton
Williams

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Michel

NOT VOTING—78

Abele
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Avery
Baring
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Bolling
Bonner
Buckley
Burleson
Colmer
Cramer
Davis, Tenn.
Dorn
Dowdy
Edmondson
Elliott
Farbstein
Feighan
Finnegan
Finno
Forrester
Gallagher

Garmatz
Gill
Grant
Hagan, Ga.
Hanna
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Herlong
Hoffman
Horton
Huddleston
Jensen
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Kee
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Landrum
Lankford
Libonati
Lloyd
Maillard
Martin, Calif.
May
Meador
Miller, Calif.

Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Montoya
Morris
Morton
Norblad
Olsen, Mont.
Patman
Pepper
Philbin
Picher
Powell
Rains
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Shipley
Teague, Tex.
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Watson
White
Whitten
Wickersham
Winstead

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Michel against.
Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hoffman against.
Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Winstead against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Dorn against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Whitten against.
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Ashmore against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Gill with Mrs. May.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Abele.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Martin of California.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Maillard.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Meador.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Shipley with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Libonati with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Bass.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Grant.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Udall.
Mr. White with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Vanik.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Olsen of Montana.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Finnegan.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON]. Had he been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SOUTH DAKOTA WOMAN NAMED "NATIONAL MOTHER OF THE YEAR"

(Mr. REIFEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, May 10, is Mother's Day. This year Mother's Day will have an extra special meaning for us in South Dakota. We are extremely proud of the fact that South Dakota's "Mother of the Year," Mrs. L. M. Stavig, has been named today as "National American Mother of the Year."

It is not only a great honor for Mrs. Stavig, but also a compliment to the State of South Dakota and the fine people who make the State their home.

Mrs. Stavig is the wife of the president of Augustana College in Sioux Falls, S.D., and has been active in church and civic affairs. She was national chairman of the Literature Committee of the Women's Missionary Federation of the

Evangelical Lutheran Church from 1936 to 1942 and was national vice president of the federation from 1942 to 1946.

She has lent her talents to music groups and the Association of University Women throughout all of her adult life. She is a lecturer, a writer, a book reviewer and counts among her host of friends thousands of students, many of them from foreign countries.

Mrs. Stavig is the mother of four sons, all of whom have been successful in various professional fields. Two of her sons have followed in the family tradition and are successful college faculty members, another is serving his country as a hospital commander at Otis Air Force Base, Mass., and the fourth is an industrial engineer for the John Morrell & Co., in Sioux Falls.

All the sons attended Augustana College, of which their father, Dr. Lawrence M. Stavig, has been president since 1943. I am sure that Mrs. Stavig would be the first to admit that much of the credit for her great achievements belongs to her outstanding husband.

I am sure that the Nation joins all South Dakota and the many friends of Mrs. Stavig in extending sincere congratulations to this fine woman and outstanding mother.

FINO URGES INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce today a measure providing for a 10-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits. This bill is designed to give our senior citizens a share in the United States' increased national wealth, to lift them out of the morass of actual poverty or off the narrow edge of dreary subsistence living. An increase in benefits is overdue. We should act today, at a time when the whole Nation has focused attention on President Johnson's war on poverty.

Poverty hurts not only those who are poor: it hurts every one of us who have seen poverty in any of its manifestations; it hurts this country which has prided itself for so many years on generosity, largeness of spirit, and sympathy for the oppressed. We are all aware today that one-fifth of this Nation does not share in the general abundance. We have begun the fight to eliminate poverty, to end this evil which throws a dark shadow over all of us. President Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, with its companion measures, will do much to lift the poor out of hopeless misery. But we must not forget other segments of the population who will not be directly benefited by results of the war on poverty.

The aged make up a great proportion of the poor. Families headed by persons aged 65 or over make up one-third of all families below the poverty line; but the frequency of these aged families in the population is only one in seven. We must ask ourselves the reason for this high incidence of poverty among a group

which has given so much to our country and deserves at least a comfortable old age in return.

A few statistics, Mr. Speaker, will help pinpoint the causes of this poverty. Social security payments are practically the sole source of cash income for almost one-fifth of aged couples and one-third of the unmarried aged, those who are widowed, divorced, or who have never married. The average monthly payment for a retired worker is little more than \$76 a month, or \$912 a year. Married couples living on social security alone received an average income of \$129 a month, or \$1,548 a year. Thirty percent of all aged couples, or 3 families out of every 10, had incomes less than \$2,000 a year. And economists have taken \$3,000 as a figure denoting the poverty line.

Cold statistics do not tell the whole story. They do not describe the lives of these social security beneficiaries who are trying to live on less than \$80 a month per person with constantly rising expenses. Statistics can not convey any impression of the constant fear of illness and unforeseen emergencies which could make it impossible to save enough out of the monthly benefit check to buy enough food.

Nearly two-fifths of the persons who are receiving old age assistance already have social security benefits. Three-fifths of all new applications for old age assistance are from individuals who have social security protection. They have found that social security cannot give them the bare necessities of life. This is a picture of poverty, a clear portrait of inadequate benefits under social security.

Obviously my bill will not solve all the financial problems which beset the aged. No increase in social security could do that, because social security is not designed to serve as a fund for unexpected emergency expenses. But a 10-percent across-the-board increase in benefits would at least allow the aged, the widows, and the disabled to buy the necessities of life, to eat enough food and enjoy a few of the small luxuries which the rest of us take for granted.

The increase in social security benefits would not only help the aged but it would pour more funds into the economy in the same way that the tax cut did. The extra money each month would be spent. Furthermore, a portion of the one and a half million people over 65 might be able to retire if benefits were raised. Too many today want to retire, but do not feel that they can afford the loss of steady wages. The jobs released by more retirement would be available to the unemployed.

A 10-percent increase in benefits is not only a moral duty, but a logical correction of an inequity. It has been an established principle, both in original concept and in operation to maintain the purchasing power of social security benefits. Benefits have not been increased since 1958; during that time, the Consumer Price Index has risen by over 6 percent. It is obvious that benefit still paid in 1964 dollars but at a 1958 rate will not buy as much as they once did.

The aged, who cannot rely on wage increases or greater profit margins, are left far behind in the growing prosperity.

Not only has the cost of living increased since 1958 but the general standard of living has gone up. American families are better off than ever before. We are able to spend more on education, recreation, and the other benefits of a material civilization. But the aged, who helped to bring about this prosperity, do not share in its blessings. Their budgets do not include sums for recreation, entertainment and travel. Too many of the aged must rely on old age assistance, medical assistance for the aged, and the charity of those who love them. This is not right, when a 10-percent increase in benefits will do much to relieve their financial difficulties.

An increase in the general level of benefits would almost immediately reach almost 80 percent of the retired aged population. It is not difficult to imagine the increased spending this would engender; and let me emphasize once again that this spending would not be for luxuries, but for the necessities of life. We can no longer feel complacent about our social security system when so many elder citizens need outside assistance, or are forced to live a cheerless existence on their small monthly payments.

A general 10-percent increase in benefits would help some who do not need the increase. But prosperous elder citizens do not make up a large proportion of the total, and there appears no justifiable alternative to a general rise in benefits.

An increase in benefits, Mr. Speaker, will not perfect the social security system. I have introduced other legislation designed to modernize the social security system and rid it of the anomalies and inequities which make it unfair in operation. I would reduce the retirement age, thus providing further jobs for those who need them desperately and releasing older workers who would benefit from a few more years of leisure time. I would remove the penalty for earnings after retirement age is reached and give benefits to dependent children over 18 until their schooling is finished. I would allow Federal employees to enter the social security system, if they wished.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate the purpose behind an increase in social security benefits. The aged form too great a portion of the poor; they also must gain new hope from the war on poverty. Increased benefits will give them this hope, and lessen their financial burdens. I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will give this legislation serious, immediate, and favorable consideration.

WAR ON POVERTY TO CONVERT THIS REPUBLIC INTO A SOCIALIST WELFARE STATE

(Mr. UTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's announced war on poverty appears to be the final step in convert-

ing this Republic into a Socialist welfare state. It is an admission that the Democratic Party since 1933 has been unable to attain the goals of economic growth through the free enterprise system, which is the American way of life. President Johnson is very adept at dealing with opposites. He appears on national television with a glowing report of prosperity and great economic gains, and, with only a change of scenery, he reappears from the wings of the theater with a devastating presentation of abject poverty.

You can rest assured that the European press, both in the free countries and the Communist countries, is picking up only the story of "America, the land of poverty," and is using it to prove that the capitalistic system is a failure and that Marxism is the only answer to the fulfillment of happiness.

The President returned from a 2-day trip to Appalachia where great unemployment and much poverty does in fact exist. He announced that he was amazed at the crowds that came out to greet him. He apparently did not realize that he was regarded as Santa Claus with a pack on his back, overflowing with taxpayers' money to be given away for the asking. The President's economic adviser, Walter Heller, says that poverty is a national disgrace. Poverty is not a disgrace. It is a misfortune, but it cannot be resolved by a national dole. The only disgrace is that our Government has been unable to create a favorable climate in which business can have confidence in Government and can expand.

Examining some of the legislation passed by Congress, it appears that we have done much to curtail economic growth and create unemployment. Among these is the refusal to grant a tax deduction for salaries paid to domestic help and caretakers. A million jobs would be immediately available to the lowest economic segment of unskilled labor, without any capital investment, if such a deduction were permitted. Minimum wage has created unemployment for those persons unskilled and unable to perform work at the minimum wage, even though they would like to work for less but are forced to go on welfare. Our uncontrolled imports from low-wage countries have caused widespread unemployment. For example, pig iron is coming into America from East Germany at \$35 a ton, as against \$70 a ton for American-produced pig iron. Imported fabricated steel from modern mills, built with our foreign aid money, is also causing unemployment in our steel centers.

The welfare state is not a Utopia. It is a condition bordering upon slavery, and can only be maintained by external force. As proof of this, I suggest you examine the welfare state which exists in your State penitentiaries where the unfortunate inmates are supplied with food, clothing, lodging, medical care, and free burials. The only thing that is lacking is liberty. There are bars on the windows and a 24-hour guard—not to keep the people out of this Utopia, but to keep them in.